DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 970 HE 017 083

TITLE	Maryland Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education. Fifth Annual Review.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Board for Higher Education, Annapolis.
PUB DATE	Jan 84
NOTE	111p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Maryland State Board for Higher Education, 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, MD 21401.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Persistence; Admission Criteria; College Freshmen; *College Programs; College Role; Educational Facilities; *Educational Finance; *Enrollment Trends; Financial Support; *Postsecondary Education; Private Financial Support; State Aid; *State Colleges; State Universities; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland; *Mission Statements; University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

The extent to which Maryland postsecondary institutions are fulfilling major mission statements is reviewed, by campus, and 5-year program plans are presented. In addition, information is presented on enrollments, programs, finance, facilities, faculty, libraries, and computer services. The admission criteria implemented by the public four-year institutions are identified, along with statistical profiles of the entering classes for 1979-1983, and retention rates for 1977-1981. Data are also presented on the percentages of lower-division students for each of the past 5 years, trends in new community college transfer students, graduate enrollment trends, and contracts and grants received at University of Maryland campuses. For each campus, information is provided on degrees to be offered and academic programs planned for the future. Additional data covers: the number of new full-time freshmen in Maryland institutions since 1980, enrollment projections, trends in part-time graduate enrollments, and the college plans of public high school seniors. Recommendations are offered on areas such as: private support for public colleges, state support for private colleges, tuition, student financial aid, budgeting, and capital projects. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240970

FIFTH ANNUAL REVIEW

MARYLAND STATEWIDE PLAN FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

maryland
State Board of
H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE017083

The Maryland State Board for Higher Education
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(301) 269-2971

January 1984

State of Maryland

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Thomas H. Maddux, Chairman

J. Harrison Ager, Vice Chairman

Gertrude H. Crist, Secretary

Dr. Thelma B. Cox

Bernard T. Devaney

Lucy Keker

Richard R. Kline

Hon. Mary L. Nock

Philip Pear

Harry K. Wells

Dr. Sheldon H. Snorr
Commissioner of Higher Education

The Maryland State Board for Higher Education is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	Institutional Roles and Missions	1
II.	Enrollments	45
III.	Programs	61
IV.	Finance	81
V.	Facilities	103
VI.	Faculty, Libraries, and Computer Services	109

I. INSTITUTIONAL ROLES AND MISSIONS

The Statewide Plan identifies general segmental and institutional missions for public institutions. This Chapter is a summary of the extent to which campuses are fulfilling major mission objectives. In addition, five year program plans are included to delineate campus missions in terms of future academic programs development.

ADMISSIONS POLICIES

The Plan provides that each public four-year college and university develop appropriate admissions criteria for predicting student success in its programs. Each institution was to utilize these criteria for admitting students to its entering freshman class beginning in the Fall of 1979, with full implementation not later than Fall, 1980.

Status

University of Maryland. The University of Maryland traditionally has utilized a combination of SAT scores and high school grade-point average (GPA) as the basis for admitting freshmen. The sliding scale permits a student with a low high school GPA to compensate by performing well on the SAT and vice-versa. The University modified its predictive indices effective Fall 1980, raising the cut-off scores needed for assured admission. Under this policy up to 15% of the entering freshman class, University-wide, could be admitted as exemptions to the regular admission criteria as opposed to the previous 6% for each campus. These admissions standards also were used to admit the Fall 1981 and 1982 entering classes.

For the 1983 entering class, these standards were modified. The new policies had three admissions categories. (1) Preferred Admissions Category which insured unconditional acceptance of students whose SAT/GPA combinations were in a relatively high range; (2) Regular Admissions Category which provided admission on a space available basis to students with SAT/GPA combinations below the range specified for preferred admissions but above a specified minimum; and (3) Individual Admissions Criteria developed by each campus, which continued to be used to admit up to the equivalent of 15% of entering students, University-wide, who are not eligible for admission under the first two sets of criteria.

For the class entering in Fall, 1984, the University of Maryland will maintain three categories of admission, but modify the criteria for being assigned to each. Beginning in the Fall of 1984 students must have both a 3.0 GPA and a Combined SAT of at least 800 to qualify for preferred admission. For regular admission, a student must have SAT/GPA Combinations ranging from at least 650/2.75 to 1030/2.00. In addition, freshmen admitted

beginning in Fall 1984 will be required to have specified high school courses. These are shown in Table 1 and will be phased in through Fall, 1988.

State Universities and Colleges. Some of the institutions under the governance of the Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges had open-door admissions policies prior to 1980. The University of Baltimore as an upper division institution admits no freshmen. A new policy adopted for implementation in Fall 1980 by the Board of Trustees set a high school average of "C" as a minimum requirement for admission to the State Universities and Colleges. Each institution also was required to develop an index for predicting academic success over and above this minimum requirement. All institutions use combinations of SAT scores and high school grade-point averages for this purpose. Also part of the BTSUC policy is a provision permitting each institution to admit up to 15% of its new freshman class as exemptions to the regular admissions criteria. Salisbury State College and Towson State University have adopted lower limits - 5% and 3%, respectively. Frostburg makes no exceptions.

In March 1982, the Board of Trustees adopted new minimum standards for admission to the State colleges and Universities. These new requirements will be phased in between 1984 and 1989 in order to provide prospective students and the high schools with sufficient time to make adequate preparation. The new minimum requirements provide for specific high school courses to be completed. The plan for phasing in these requirements is shown in Table 2. Individual campuses may continue to add additional requirements.

Morgan State University. Morgan implemented admissions criteria beginning in Fall, 1981. A combined SAT score of 750 and a high school GPA of 2.0 are required for admission. Morgan admits up to 15% of entering students as exemptions. These policies continued in effect for the Fall 1983 entering class.

St. Mary's College. St. Mary's College has adopted as admission criteria combined SAT scores of no less than 900 and a high school grade point average of 2.5 or greater. After April 15 the criteria are lowered on a space available basis to combined SAT scores of 800 or above and a 2.0 high school average. St. Mary's plans to admit 15% of its freshman class as exemptions to regular admission criteria.

Exemptions to Regular Admissions Policies. As noted above, most four-year institutions have included provisions for the admission of a proportion of the freshman class outside regular admissions criteria. In all cases institutions have developed alternate criteria for determining which students are to be admitted as exemptions. This appears to be a sound approach for taking into account certain characteristics that may help to predict success for students who have not performed well enough

TABLE 1

HIGH SCHOOL COURSES REQUIRED FOR
REGULAR AND PREFERRED ADMISSION TO
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AS OF FALL, 1988

Subject	Year Courses
English	4
Social Science/History	3
Science (Lab)	2
Mathematics Algebra I Geometry Algebra II	3
Total Stipulated	12
Electives	8
	20

PHASE-IN SCHEDULE

Fall, 1984 - Admitted students will be required to offer high school preparation in English (4 years), Social Science/History (3 years), Science (2 years), Mathematics (2 years - one course at least at the level of Algebra I is required).

Fall, 1985 - One of the two science courses will involve laboratory work.

Fall, 1986 - The two mathematics courses will be at least at the level of Algebra I and Plane Geometry.

Fall, 1987 - Both science courses will be laboratory based.

Fall, 1988 - The third year of mathematics (including a second course in Algebra) will be required.

TABLE 2

PHASE-IN PLAN
HIGH SCHOOL MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS
BOARD OF TRUSTEES, STATE UNIVERSITIES & COLLEGES

SUBJECT	ACADEMIC YEAR 1984-1985	1985-1986	1986-1987	1987-1988	1988-1989
English	4	4	4	4	4
Composition	1*	1	1	1	1
American Literature		[1 or	1	1	1
English Literature		1*]	1	1	1
Other (Pref. Comp. or Lit.)				1	1
Unspecified	3	2	1		
Social Science	3	3	3	3	3
U. S. History	1	1	1	1	1
American Government	1	1	1	1	1
World Civilization				1*	1
Unspecified	1	1	1		
Science	2	2	2	2	2
Biology (Lab)		1*	1	1	1
Other (Lab)				1*	1
Unspecified	2	1	1		
Mathematics	2	2	2	2	3
Algebra I	1*	1	1	1	1
Geometry			1*	1	1
Algebra II					1*
Unspecified	1	1			
TOTAL	11	11	11	11	12
Electives	9	9	9	9	8

* New subjects not currently required for graduation from a Maryland secondary school.

on standardized tests to be admitted. Table 3 indicates the specific criteria utilized by institutions in making exceptions to their regular admissions policies, the percentage of entering freshmen admitted as exceptions, and the percentage allowed under institutional or segmental policy.

Among the institutions governed by BTSUC, most campuses were below or very near their planned limitations. Coppin, with 20% exemptions, exceeded the 15% level, increasing its percentage of exemptions from 16% in 1981. Within the University of Maryland system, UMES admitted 33% of its entering freshmen as exceptions to university admissions criteria. This is possible because the University's 15% exemptions policy applies to all campuses combined, and UMBC and UMCP exempted only 10% and 6%, respectively. The 33% level of exemptions, while a decrease from the 47% and 41% levels of exemptions in 1980 and 1979, respectively, is an increase over the 28% level of 1981. The high levels of exemptions in 1979 and 1980 at UMES resulted in a recommendation in the 1981 Annual Review that the campus take measures to restrict its exemptions to a level closer to the University-wide level. While the reduction in 1981 was in a direction consistent with this recommendation, the increase in 1982 suggests the achievement of a 15% level may be difficult, particularly in light of the declining general pool from which freshmen are drawn. The University is giving priority to increasing the ability of the entering class at UMES, even if the result will be smaller numbers of entering freshmen.

The Second Annual Review provides for public institutions to annually report to the SBHE those students admitted as exemptions to regular admissions criteria. The State's Desegregation Plan also requires this. All institutions have complied with this provision for 1980, 1981, and 1982 entering classes. The SBHE will monitor the effectiveness of the policies utilized by institutions to exempt students from regular criteria through periodic reports in its series of reports on retention.*

Assessment

All public four-year institutions which admit freshmen now have in place higher entrance requirements than in 1978 and most have plans for yet higher entrance standards in coming years. These policy changes promise to have far-reaching effects. Not only should they result in generally improved retention rates and increase the attractiveness of the campuses to high ability students, but they also eventually should improve high school preparation, thereby decreasing the need for remediation at the college level.

*The first publications in this series are Volumes I and II of "Retention, Progression and Transfer at Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions," SBHE, April 1982.

TABLE 3

EXEMPTIONS TO REGULAR ADMISSIONS CRITERIA

	1982			1983	
	% Planned Exemp.	% Actual Exemp.	Criteria	% Planned Exemp.	Criteria
BTSUC					
Bowie	15%	10%	1. Participation in extra curricular activities. 2. Leadership 3. Improvement in grades during high school. 4. Unique work experience. 5. Membership in organizations.	15%	No Change
Coppin	15%	20%	1. Motivation 2. Time management strategies. 3. Goal clarifications.	15%	No Change
Frostburg	0%	0%	Not Applicable	0%	Not Applicable
Salisbury	5%	1%	1. HS recommendations. 2. Interview 3. Non-traditional variables	5%	No Change
Towson	3%	0%	1. Non-traditional variables. 2. HS recommendations. 3. Interview.	3%	No Change
Morgan	Up to 15%	11%	1. Special talents and aptitudes. 2. Potential for academic success. 3. High school recommendations. 4. Interview.	Up To 15%	No Change

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

EXEMPTIONS TO REGULAR
ADMISSIONS CRITERIA

	1982			1983	
	% Planned Exemp.	% Actual Exemp.	Criteria	% Planned Exemp.	Criteria
St. Mary's	10-15%	15%	1. Clarity of purpose. 2. Maturity. 3. Motivation. 4. Understanding of the nature of a liberal arts college.	15%	1. Recommendations 2. Essays 3. Interview 4. Predicted freshman G.P.A. of 2.0
University of Maryland					
UMBC	15%*	10%	1. Special talents. 2. Motivation. 3. Potential for academic success.	15%*	No Change
UMCP	15%*	6%	1. Special aptitudes. 2. Leadership potential. 3. Extenuating circumstances. 4. Maturity and experience.	15%*	No Change
UMES	15%*	33%	1. HS GPA between 1.5 and 2.0. 2. HS recommendations. 3. Basic skills test scores. 4. Interviews. 5. Exceptional talent or aptitude.	15%*	No Change

* University-wide - no specific limitations per campus for the percentage of exemptions permitted.

Tables 4-13 are statistical profiles of the entering classes at public four-year campuses. These tables, which are published in each Annual Review, provide relevant information concerning the characteristics of each entering class. Of particular interest are institutional retention rates, which reflect the effectiveness of admissions policies. Because most institutions raised standards beginning in 1980, comparing retention rates for that and subsequent entering classes with those of prior entering classes will be of interest. The effects of increasing admissions standards have already become apparent at UMCP and UMBC, where retention rates have increased steadily. On the other hand, the trend in retention rates has been a downward one at Bowie.

PERCENTAGE OF UNDERGRADUATES IN THE LOWER DIVISION

The Plan recommends that by Fall 1982 each public college and university (except for UMCP) have no more than 60 percent of its undergraduates in the lower division (freshmen and sophomores). The goal for UMCP is 45%. These percentages of lower division enrollments would make Maryland public four-year institutions more comparable to their national counterparts in terms of the balance between lower and upper division emphasis, would be consistent with their identified missions of decreasing their emphasis on lower division education, and would assure less duplication with the mission of community colleges, which are entirely lower division. In the long term, retaining students and attracting upper division transfer students from community colleges provide the means by which the upper division orientation of these institutions can be increased.

Status

Table 14 shows the percentages of lower division students for each of the past five years. Three schools, Towson, Salisbury, and Frostburg have remained within the desired range since the adoption of the Plan. In fact, Salisbury and Towson have lower percentages of freshmen and sophomores than five years ago. Coppin, which had been above the desired level moved to within the desired range in Fall 1981 and remained there in 1982. Morgan, which was well above the recommended level in 1977, has made steady and substantial progress.

UMCP also has made steady progress toward its 45% goal. While it did not reach this level in 1982, the progress to date has been significant, particularly considering the large number of students involved.

Bowie was within the desired range in 1978 but has moved slightly above it since. St. Mary's College has remained higher than desired each year. Two schools, UMBC and UMES, have been well above the desired level. UMES has shown improvement for the past three years, while UMBC has shown improvement for the past two. UMBC should be near the 60% level in Fall 1983 as a result of its marked improvement in retention.

TABLE 4

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- BOWIE STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	302	307	292	297	292
SAT-M Mean	319	332	323	331	327
Combined SAT	621	639	615	628	619
HS GPA Mean	N.A.	2.31	2.30	2.33	N.A.
Acceptance Rates (1)					
- In-State Students	86%	83%	84%	81%	78%
- Out-of-State Students	32%	56%	67%	69%	63%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (2)	-	22%	19%	10%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (3)	344	293	281	256	282
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3), (4)	-	375	351	344	337

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (3)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	64%	69%	63%	60%	56%
Enrolled after second year	50%	50%	44%	45%	
Enrolled after third year	42%	38%	35%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) In Fall 1979 Bowie had an open-door admission policy
(3) Full-time only
(4) The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at Bowie

TABLE 5

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- COPPIN STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	273	282	275	291	294
SAT-M Mean	298	297	306	306	316
Combined SAT	571	579	581	597	610
HS GPA Mean	2.50	2.65	2.51	2.51	N.A.
Acceptance Rate (1)					
- In-State Students	74%	67%	70%	68%	66%
- Out-of-State Students	50%	51%	48%	56%	67%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (2)	-	12%	16%	20%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (3)	477	359	380	355	476
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3), (4)	-	435	435	429	429

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (3)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	60%	53%	55%	42%	53%
Enrolled after second year	36%	30%	29%	28%	
Enrolled after third year	26%	22%	25%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) In Fall 1979 Coppin had an open-door admission policy
(3) Full-time only
(4) The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at Coppin

TABLE 6

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	413	407	420	410	406
SAT-M Mean	451	439	453	449	433
Combined SAT	864	846	873	859	839
HS GPA Mean	3.00	2.91	2.90	2.77	N.A.
Acceptance Rate (1)					
- In-State Students	81%	83%	74%	78%	77%
- Out-of-State Students	73%	76%	73%	68%	62%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	-	0%	0%	0%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (2)	737	750	718	736	642
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2)	800	800	780	780	780

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (2) 1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	69%	71%	71%	66%	70%
Enrolled after second year	49%	54%	50%	46%	
Enrolled after third year	44%	50%	45%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) Full-time only

TABLE 7

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	306	300	296	310	309
SAT-M Mean	329	331	324	333	333
Combined SAT	635	631	620	643	642
HS GPA Mean	2.65	2.61	2.58	2.67	N.A.
Acceptance Rate (1)					
- In-State Students	85%	87%	84%	83%	87%
- Out-of-State Students	74%	72%	71%	62%	65%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (2)	-	-	11%	11%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (3)	864	805	898	850	813
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3), (4)	-	880	800	800	800

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (3)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	59%	69%	66%	61%	63%
Enrolled after second year	45%	52%	49%	44%	
Enrolled after third year	39%	43%	42%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) In Fall 1979 and Fall 1980 Morgan had an open-door admission policy
(3) Full-time only
(4) The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at Morgan

TABLE 8

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- SALISBURY STATE COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	411	408	422	414	422
SAT-M Mean	446	440	454	452	449
Combined SAT	857	848	876	866	871
HS GPA (1) Mean	2.66	2.62	2.62	2.61	N.A.
Acceptance rate (2)					
- In-State students	82%	81%	77%	79%	79%
- Out-of-State students	75%	63%	64%	70%	76%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions (3)	-	11%	2%	1%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (4)	712	622	620	659	721
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (4)	800	725	700	700	720

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (4)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	68%	71%	67%	70%	72%
Enrolled after second year	53%	53%	53%	52%	
Enrolled after third year	47%	47%	45%		

(1) H.S. grade average in acdemic subjects only
(2) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(3) In Fall 1979 Salisbury had an open-door admissions policy
(4) Full-time only

TABLE 9

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- ST. MARY'S COLLEGE -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	466	496	456	466	467
SAT-M Mean	483	475	478	487	486
Combined SAT	949	971	934	953	953
HS GPA Mean	2.79	2.82	2.84	2.73	N.A.
Acceptance rate (1)					
- In-State students	74%	73%	79%	78%	81%
- Out-of-State students	57%	59%	74%	83%	72%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	N.A.	8%	16%	N.A.	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (2)	350	303	319	320	284
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2), (3)	-	375	350	375	400

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (2)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	70%	68%	68%	68%	65%
Enrolled after second year	39%	50%	42%	40%	
Enrolled after third year	34%	42%	38%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) Full-time only
(3) The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at St. Mary's

TABLE 10

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	431	426	430	440	437
SAT-M Mean	464	460	461	471	474
Combined SAT	895	886	891	911	911
HS GPA (1) Mean	2.96	2.89	2.89	2.93	N.A.
Acceptance Rate (2)					
- In-State students	83%	85%	83%	77%	79%
- Out-of-State students	69%	74%	73%	62%	76%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	-	1%	1%	0%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (3)	2078	2033	1898	1609	1904
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (3)	2050	2000	2000	1950	1950

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (3)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	70%	75%	73%	71%	73%
Enrolled after second year	56%	61%	57%	58%	
Enrolled after third year	51%	54%	52%		

(1) H.S. grade average in academic subjects only
(2) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(3) Full-time only

TABLE 11

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- UMBC -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	422	424	432	441	455
SAT-M Mean	460	465	478	490	509
Combined SAT	882	889	910	931	964
HS GPA Mean	3.04	2.84	2.81	2.87	N.A.
Acceptance rate (1)					
- In-State students	88%	85%	81%	79%	75%
- Out-of-State students	70%	83%	63%	67%	61%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	6%	5%	6%	10%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (2)	1385	1390	1271	1415	1318
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2), (3)	-	1550	1475	1400	1500

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (2)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	62%	65%	68%	70%	71%
Enrolled after second year	42%	43%	46%	52%	
Enrolled after third year	32%	34%	36%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applicants
(2) Full-time only
(3) The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman enrollment limitation at UMBC

TABLE 12

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- UMCP -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	450	456	457	463	464
SAT-M Mean	510	510	513	519	525
Combined SAT	960	966	970	982	989
HS GPA Mean	N.A.	N.A.	2.92	2.91	N.A.
Acceptance rate (1)					
- In-State students	89%	81%	82%	83%	84%
- Out-of-State students	78%	67%	58%	57%	67%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	4%	6%	6%	6%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual (2)	5161	4596	4362	4189	4399
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2)	4400	4600	4500	4400	4300

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (2)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	77%	78%	79%	82%	79%
Enrolled after second year	63%	65%	67%	67%	
Enrolled after third year	57%	59%	60%		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) Full-time only

TABLE 13

PROFILE OF FRESHMAN CLASS
- UMES -

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983*
SAT-V Mean	310	323	338	338	332
SAT-M Mean	344	358	366	369	364
Combined SAT	654	681	704	707	696
HS GPA Mean	2.5	2.36	2.42	2.41	N.A.
Acceptance rate (1)					
- In-State students	88%	98%	89%	96%	95%
- Out-of-State students	78%	71%	89%	86%	92%
% of freshman class admitted as exemptions	41%	47%	28%	33%	N.A.
N of freshman class - actual	352	229	307	274	247
N of freshman class - State Plan limit (2), (3)	-	450	305	350	360

*Preliminary

Retention Rates

	Freshman Class (2)				
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Enrolled after first year	(4)	(5)	(6)	53%	64%
Enrolled after second year	(4)	(5)	(6)	35%	
Enrolled after third year	(4)	(5)	(6)		

(1) Number of acceptances divided by number of applications
(2) Full-time only
(3) The State Plan did not provide for Fall 1979 freshman limitation at UMES
(4) Did not submit data tape or student roster in 1977
(5) Did not submit data tape or student roster in 1978
(6) Submitted roster but could not identify new freshmen in 1979

TABLE 14

PERCENT OF CLASSIFIED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS
AT FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE LEVELS

	Fall 1978	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1982 Goal
University of Maryland						
UMBC	63.1%	78.8%	80.4%	67.4%	63.5%	60% or below
UMCP	52.6%	51.9%	51.2%	50.0%	48.2%	45% or below
UMES	67.5%	72.6%	71.8%	69.2%	68.4%	60% or below
State Colleges and Universities						
Bowie	58.5%	62.4%	62.3%	63.3%	61.6%	60% or below
Coppin	68.2%	66.0%	61.6%	57.6%	59.8%	60% or below
Frostburg	58.0%	60.5%	59.5%	56.3%	59.1%	60% or below
Salisbury	58.2%	56.7%	53.9%	55.6%	57.1%	60% or below
Towson	52.1%	53.7%	53.5%	51.1%	49.5%	60% or below
Morgan State University						
	73.3%	69.3%	68.2%	64.8%	64.4%	60% or below
St. Mary's College						
	62.2%	63.6%	65.8%	64.4%	63.6%	60% or below

Assessment

Most institutions are either maintaining or are well on their way to achieving the desired balance between upper division and lower division students.

COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

The Plan recommends that all public colleges and universities devote special attention to enrolling community college graduates as part of their efforts to increase their emphasis on upper division enrollments. Such arrangements are important for attracting transfer students, as they provide information to the prospective transfer student at the point of initial enrollment concerning those courses that can be transferred into specific programs. The First Annual Review provided for Morgan and St. Mary's, which did not have formal articulation arrangements in existence or under development at that time, to develop such arrangements. The Second Annual Review again recommended that Morgan develop articulation agreements with community colleges in its region.

Status

The University of Maryland has had a well-developed and centrally-coordinated program of articulation with community colleges for a number of years. These arrangements have been updated as new programs have been added.

The institutions under the governance of the Board of Trustees developed formal articulation arrangements in phases. The first set of arrangements, involving specialized/professional programs, was completed in July 1980. The second phase involved articulation with liberal arts programs. This phase was completed in 1981.

St. Mary's, as provided in the First Annual Review of the Plan, has developed policies concerning the transferrability of courses into each of its divisions from those community colleges from which it receives most of its transfer students.

To date Morgan has developed articulation agreements only for two technical programs at the Community College of Baltimore: Gerontology and Mental Health.

Trends in new transfer students enrolled are shown in Table 15. The number of new transfers rose in 1982 to the 1980 level, following a slight downturn in 1981. A pattern of consistent growth has been evident at UMBC, while most other campuses have experienced fluctuations or smaller increases.

TABLE 15

TRENDS IN NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENTS

	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982
Bowie	129	135	128	115
Coppin	102	96	91	112
Frostburg	242	271	201	257
Morgan	158	151	117	125
Salisbury	145	162	158	156
St. Mary's	60	68	67	54
Towson	832	834	781	732
University of Baltimore	556	550	474	538
UMAB	140	138	171	166
UMBC	345	372	425	496
UMCP	1,625	1,748	1,670	1,749
UMES	6	13	18	27
UMUC	673	693	566	704
TOTAL	5,013	5,231	4,867	5,241

Note: The number of new community college transfer students was obtained by matching the student data tape for each public four-year institution with the data records for all students enrolled in Maryland community colleges during the prior year. The trends from year to year are of interest for planning purposes rather than the actual number of students transferring at any point in time.

Assessment

All public four-year institutions, except Morgan, now have comprehensive articulation policies with community colleges. Morgan has developed articulation arrangements to only a limited degree. Morgan needs to develop such policies in order to enhance its undergraduate enrollment prospects and to continue to increase its emphasis on upper division instruction. Being the only public four-year institution in the State without a comprehensive set of agreements places Morgan at a distinct disadvantage in recruiting upper division students.

Action

MORGAN SHOULD PLACE GREATER EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE SET OF ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS WITH NEARBY COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND SHOULD CONTINUE TO FILE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS WITH THE SBHE.

GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS

The Plan provides for the University of Maryland campuses and Morgan State University to increase the emphasis placed on graduate education. Morgan's emphasis in the graduate area is to be on programs serving urban needs. The State Colleges and Universities are to continue to offer masters programs and may contribute to joint doctoral or advanced certificate programs.

Status

Table 16 provides information concerning graduate enrollments at campuses of the University of Maryland for the past five years. Since 1978 total graduate enrollments for the system have increased by about 4%. Growth among full-time graduate students has taken place since 1978 while the numbers of part-time graduate students have changed only slightly for this period. Growth has taken place at the doctoral level, among both full-time and part-time students.

UMAB has had an increase in graduate enrollments of almost 17% since 1978. Growth has been concentrated among part-time students. In addition to its graduate enrollments, UMAB currently enrolls almost 2100 students in its Dental, Medical, and Law programs. UMBC has 11% more graduate students than in 1978, but fewer than in 1980. Growth at the doctoral level has been steady while masters-level enrollments have fluctuated. UMCP, while experiencing relative stability in terms of total enrollments, has shown growth in the enrollment of doctoral students. Both UMES and UMUC have initiated graduate programs within the past five years. UMES now enrolls over 60 graduate students while UMUC enrolls almost 600 at a variety of locations throughout the State.

TABLE 16

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
			ALL LEVELS		
Full-Time					
UMAB	670	665	662	698	647
UMBC	93	119	128	168	185
UMCP	2,563	2,581	2,706	2,786	2,816
UMES	3	10	4	7	8
UMUC	15	38	10	18	6
TOTAL	3,344	3,413	3,510	3,677	3,662
Part-Time					
UMAB	645	691	790	778	770
UMBC	303	269	351	259	253
UMCP	4,920	4,776	4,844	4,740	4,666
UMES	33	38	58	53	56
UMUC	384	562	622	495	582
TOTAL	6,285	6,336	6,665	6,325	6,327
Total					
UMAB	1,315	1,356	1,452	1,476	1,417
UMBC	396	388	479	427	438
UMCP	7,483	7,357	7,550	7,526	7,482
UMES	36	48	62	60	64
UMUC	399	600	632	513	588
TOTAL	9,629	9,749	10,175	10,002	9,989
			BY PROGRAM LEVEL		
MASTERS - Full-Time	1,927	1,908	1,971	2,025	2,070
= Part-Time	3,618	3,574	3,635	3,331	3,372
= Total	5,545	5,482	5,606	5,356	5,442
DOCTORAL - Full-Time	1,345	1,387	1,416	1,518	1,491
= Part-Time	1,834	1,888	1,952	1,992	1,983
= Total	3,179	3,275	3,368	3,510	3,474
UNCLASSIFIED - Full-Time	72	118	123	134	101
= Part-Time	833	874	1,078	1,002	972
= Total	905	992	1,201	1,136	1,073
ALL GRADUATE - Full-Time	3,344	3,413	3,510	3,677	3,662
= Part-Time	6,285	6,336	6,665	6,325	6,327
= Total	9,629	9,749	10,175	10,002	9,989

TABLE 16 (Cont'd)

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS

UMAB

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
MASTERS - Full-Time	603	597	545	580	570
- Part-Time	486	526	589	576	518
= Total	1,089	1,123	1,134	1,156	1,088
DOCTORAL - Full-Time	62	65	69	63	67
- Part-Time	126	144	150	159	181
= Total	188	209	219	222	248
UNCLASSIFIED - Full-Time	5	3	48	55	10
- Part-Time	33	21	51	43	71
= Total	38	24	99	98	81
ALL GRADUATE - Full-Time	670	665	662	698	647
- Part-Time	645	691	790	778	770
= Total	1,214	1,245	1,341	1,476	1,417

UMBC

MASTERS - Full-Time	80	64	86	102	108
- Part-Time	230	149	142	124	112
= Total	310	213	228	226	220
DOCTORAL - Full-Time	13	19	23	42	43
- Part-Time	14	26	38	39	44
= Total	27	45	61	81	87
UNCLASSIFIED - Full-Time	0	36	19	24	34
- Part-Time	59	94	171	96	97
= Total	59	130	190	120	131
ALL GRADUATE - Full-Time	93	119	128	168	185
- Part-Time	303	269	351	259	253
= Total	396	388	479	427	438

TABLE 16 (Cont'd)

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
UMCP					
MASTERS - Full-Time	1,226	1,206	1,326	1,318	1,380
= Part-Time	2,485	2,299	2,243	2,165	2,131
= Total	4,711	3,505	3,569	3,483	3,511
DOCTORAL - Full-Time	1,270	1,303	1,324	1,413	1,381
= Part-Time	1,694	1,718	1,764	1,794	1,758
= Total	2,964	3,021	3,088	3,207	3,139
UNCLASSIFIED - Full-Time	67	72	56	55	55
= Part-Time	741	759	837	781	777
= Total	808	831	893	836	832
ALL GRADUATE - Full-Time	2,563	2,581	2,706	2,786	2,816
= Part-Time	4,920	4,776	4,844	4,740	4,666
= Total	7,483	7,357	7,550	7,526	7,482
UMES					
MASTERS - Full-Time	3	10	4	7	6
= Part-Time	33	38	39	31	29
= Total	36	48	43	38	35
UNCLASSIFIED - Full-Time	0	0	0	0	2
= Part-Time	0	0	19	22	27
= Total	0	0	19	22	29
TOTAL - Full-Time	3	10	4	7	8
= Part-Time	33	38	58	53	56
= Total	36	48	62	60	64
UMUC					
MASTERS - Full-Time	15	31	10	18	6
= Part-Time	384	562	622	435	582
= Total	399	593	632	453	588
UNCLASSIFIED - Full-Time	0	7	0	0	0
= Part-Time	0	0	0	60	0
= Total	0	7	0	60	0
TOTAL - Full-Time	15	38	10	18	6
= Part-Time	384	562	622	495	582
= Total	399	600	632	513	588

Table 17 shows trends in graduate enrollments at Morgan State University. The campus, which experienced a sharp drop in graduate enrollments through 1979, appears to have reversed this trend. Its full-time masters program enrollments have increased by 50% since 1979 and the enrollments in its recently-initiated doctoral program have grown steadily.

Table 18 shows trends in graduate enrollments at the State Colleges and Universities. All graduate programs at these institutions are at the masters level. In addition to its graduate programs, the University of Baltimore enrolls over 900 students in its Law School. Overall, graduate enrollments are down for the 1978-81 period. Full-time students have grown while part-time enrollments have decreased. Bowie, Coppin, Salisbury, and Towson have had declines; Frostburg has experienced relative stability; the University of Baltimore has had strong growth.

Assessment

The increases in doctoral enrollments at the University of Maryland campuses are encouraging, as the Statewide Plan provides for the University, along with Morgan, to have the only role in the public sector and to increasingly emphasize this role. At Morgan, graduate enrollments in general appear to have begun to increase. The continued increases in full-time and doctoral enrollments also is a positive trend for Morgan.

At most of the State universities and colleges, graduate enrollment levels depend to a large extent on the demand for graduate education by teachers. All except one of the campuses (the University of Baltimore) in this segment have historically placed heavy emphasis on graduate education for teachers. The number of students entering teaching has decreased sharply during the past 10 years while the percentage of practicing teachers in Maryland with masters degrees, and therefore permanent certification, has increased to over 75%. These two trends have resulted in a substantial decrease in the demand for graduate education by teachers. Both Morgan and UMCP, which also heavily emphasize graduate programs in education, have experienced similar declines in part-time masters-level enrollments.

Despite a number of uncertainties, overall prospects for attracting graduate students in the future appear good. A recent followup study of graduates of Maryland's public four-year institutions conducted by the SBHE and the segments indicates that 85% intend to pursue graduate study at some future date. These students also rated their campuses as "good" in the preparation provided for graduate study. Finally, there is evidence that the demand for teachers, particularly at the elementary education level and in speciality areas has bottomed out. Demand for science and mathematics teachers continues to be greater than the supply. Thus, the prospect is for some

TABLE 17

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS
MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

		1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
MASTERS	- Full-Time	143	130	142	165	195
	- Part-Time	448	316	247	207	218
	= Total	591	446	389	372	413
DOCTORATE	- Full-Time	0	0	4	9	3
	- Part-Time	0	12	16	21	31
	= Total	0	12	20	30	34
UNCLASSIFIED	- Full-Time	15	0	5	3	4
	- Part-Time	73	55	74	63	38
	= Total	88	55	79	66	42
TOTAL	- Full-Time	158	130	151	177	202
	- Part-Time	521	383	337	291	287
	= Total	679	513	488	468	489

TABLE 18

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT TRENDS
STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Full-Time	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
Bowie	51	68	57	63	53
Coppin	71	63	75	40	44
Frostburg	96	66	73	57	79
Salisbury	41	44	40	43	44
Towson	151	131	131	124	124
Univ. of Baltimore	131	220	227	315	330
Total - Full Time	541	592	603	642	674
Part-Time					
Bowie	794	762	673	601	561
Coppin	204	192	200	203	183
Frostburg	472	494	483	474	474
Salisbury	676	552	583	526	456
Towson	1,682	1,323	1,280	1,201	1,183
Univ. of Baltimore	1,198	1,261	1,355	1,416	1,426
Total - Part-Time	5,026	4,584	4,574	4,421	4,283
Total					
Bowie	845	830	730	664	614
Coppin	275	255	275	243	227
Frostburg	568	540	556	531	553
Salisbury	717	596	623	569	500
Towson	1,833	1,454	1,411	1,325	1,307
Univ. of Baltimore	1,329	1,481	1,582	1,731	1,756
Grand Total	5,567	5,176	5,177	5,063	4,957

improvement in demand for graduate education for teachers eventually. An emerging trend also appears to be the enrollment of students without definite degree plans but who are taking graduate courses.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Statewide Plan identifies research as one of the primary roles of the University of Maryland and of Morgan State University. Morgan's specialized research emphasis is to be on urban problems. The research mission of the State Universities and Colleges is to be limited in scope. These campuses may encourage research and creative work in those areas which are consistent with their curricular emphases and missions. The University of Baltimore's research mission is to be consistent with the requirements of the agencies that accredit its programs and with the Statewide Plan.

Status

Contract and grant awards provide a good measure of the extent to which faculty members successfully compete with other faculty throughout the country. Table 19 shows the contracts and grants awarded to the campuses at the University of Maryland during the past five years. While not all awards are for research, about 75% are and many others are research-related. Since FY1978 the University has increased the amount of contracts and grants received by 35% and the number received by 21%. During the past year, the amount of awards increased by about $1.3M and the number of awards increased by 70. Almost all entities have had increases since 1978. UMBC and UMUC have more than doubled the amounts received since FY1978.

Morgan's major research emphasis is to be on urban-related problems. In FY1982, Morgan received research awards amounting to $1,097,253. This was a substantial increase over the FY1981 level of $834,667 and was more than triple the $348,034 received in FY1980. Morgan also received a substantial amount of non-research funding.

The institutions governed by BTSUC received grants for research, research-related and public service purposes totaling $987,849 in FY1982. St. Mary's College received 4 research grants amounting to $139,834 in FY1982.

Assessment

Both the University of Maryland and Morgan have increased the amount of research contracts and grants received in recent years. This is an encouraging development as research is an important part of the mission of these campuses and one that the Plan provides should become increasingly important for them. The University of Maryland cautions, however, that significant additional investment will be required for continued progress in improving its research mission.

TABLE 19

CONTRACTS AND GRANTS RECEIVED
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

	FY 1978	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982
UMAB					
Amount	$20,551,251	$22,1[illegible]47	$26,418,077	$24,086,519	$25,546,727
Number	192	2[illegible]	287	266	311
UMBC					
Amount	1,336,962	1,559,223	2,538,116	2,716,264	3,091,908
Number	51	48	76	71	68
UMCP					
Amount	29,209,560	27,621,877	32,129,985	40,498,896	39,530,723
Number	891	1,033	876	991	1,003
UMES					
Amount	2,659,987	2,289,971	3,407,293	3,070,106	2,370,214
Number	34	40	34	34	35
UMUC					
Amount	890,112	1,836,648	2,988,354	2,882,019	3,335,171
Number	9	12	16	16	13
CEES					
Amount	1,624,762	2,353,964	1,858,882	1,134,513	2,217,763
Number	53	35	51	41	59
TOTAL					
Amount	56,272,634	57,848,930	69,340,707	74,388,317	76,092,506
Number	1,230	1,387	1,340	1,419	1,489

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM PLANS

The Statewide Plan identifies general segmental missions for the University of Maryland, the State Colleges and Universities, and the Community Colleges. Institutional missions are identified for Morgan and St. Mary's. Beginning with the Second Annual Review, five-year program plans have been included to further delineate campus missions.

The following tables contain for each campus: degrees to be offered, major areas in which programs may be developed in the future, and academic programs that are planned to be proposed during the next five years. Each campus program plan operationally defines the future mission direction of that institution. The five-year academic program plans will be updated annually as part of the Annual Review of the Plan.

The program plans for Salisbury and UMES are consistent with the provisions of the recent cooperative agreement between the two campuses. This agreement will ensure a minimal amount of program duplication at these institutions in the future and provide the basis for increased sharing of resources by them.

INCLUSION OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM IN THE FIVE-YEAR PLANS DOES NOT IMPLY FUTURE APPROVAL BY THE SBHE. The SBHE will continue to consider each proposal for a new academic program on its merits, the need for it, its desegregation impact, the availability of funding, facilities and other resources, and on the judged ability of the institution to offer a quality program. At the same time, use of these five-year plans as blueprints for the future should significantly reduce the amount of concern about duplication by institutions and enable each institution to understand where others plan to move in the future. Those program areas designated as "cooperative" will be developed in accord with guidelines to be adopted by the SBHE.

Programs requested for inclusion by public colleges and universities in the Fifth Annual Review which were not included, were deleted without prejudice. Pending further discussion with institutional representatives, those programs may be reconsidered and may be included in the next annual review of the Statewide Master Plan.

TABLE 20

BOWIE

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Public Affairs and Services, Education, Allied Health

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- M - Management Information Systems
- M - Computer Science

1985-86
- B - Gerontology
- M - Nursing

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 21

COPPIN

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Human Resource Services, Education Specialties

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- B - Philosophical Theology
- B - Mathematics for Elementary Education
- M - Secondary Reading Specialist (Coop W/Towson)

1985-86
- B - Visual and Hearing Impaired

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 22

FROSTBURG

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Business, Education, Natural Resources

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- M - Professional Accounting
- B - Dance
- B - International Studies
- M - Special Education
- B - Music Business
- B - Graphic Design
- M - Psychology
- B - Business Education
- B - Social Work

1985-86
- B - Communications and Public Relations

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 23

MORGAN

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Business, Education, Transportation, Urban Affairs, International Studies, Engineering

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- B - Landscape Architecture
- B - Fashion Merchandising
- M - Therapeutic Recreation
- M - African-American Studies (Coop W/UMBC)
- D - History

1985-86
- B - Finance

1986-87
- D - Reading
- M - Foreign Languages (Coop W/Towson & UMBC)

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 24

ST. MARY'S

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Selected Regional Service Programs

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- B - Interdisciplinary Social Science
- B - Psychology
- B - Philosophy/Religious Studies
- B - Chemistry
- M - American Colonial History & Archeology

1985-86

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 25

TOWSON

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Fine Arts, Humanities, Communications, Allied Health, Business Administration, Education

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- M - Music
- M - Foreign Languages (Coop W/UMBC & Morgan)
- M - Professional Writing

1985-86

1986-87
- B - Industrial/Organizational Management

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 26

SALISBURY

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Education, Business, Allied Health

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- B - Commercial Art
- B - Music
- B - Mass Media
- B - Law Enforcement
- M - Public Administration
- M - Accounting
- M - Health Administration
- B - Accounting

1985-86
- B - Media Technology
- M - Recreation/Leisure Studies

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 27

UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, First-Professional (Law)

FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Business, Law, Public Administration

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85

B - Graphics & Media Technology
MJA - Judicial Administration
Grad Cert - Police Administration
Grad Cert - Correctional Administration
DBA - Business Administration (Cooperative)

1985-86

DPA - Public Administration (Cooperative)

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 28

UMAB

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate, First-Professional

FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Health, Law

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85

Advanced Cert. - Community Pharmacy
M - Toxicology (W/UMCP, UMBC, UMES)
D - Toxicology (W/UMCP & UMBC)
M,D - Human Genetics

1985-86

LL.M - Law

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 29

UMBC

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Physical and Biological Sciences, Health Services Administration, Policy Science, Psychology, Computer Science and Related Areas, Mathematical Statistics, Ethnomusicology, Engineering

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- M - Scientific and Technical Writing
- M - African-American Studies (Coop W/Morgan)
- B - Scientific Photography
- M - Emergency Health Services
- M - Foreign Languages (Coop W/Morgan & Towson)
- M - Toxicology (W/UMCP, UMAB, UMES)
- D - Toxicology (W/UMCP & UMAB)
- M,D - Computer Science (W/existing programs at UMCP)

1985-86
- M - Health Care Fiscal Planning
- M,D - Operations Analysis
- M - Health Science Policy
- M - Health Physics
- B - Occupational/Environmental Health & Safety

1986-87
- M - Water Resources Planning Management

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 30

UMCP

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctorate
FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Comprehensive

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- M - Applied Communications Management (W/UMUC)
- D - Education Administration & Curriculum & Instruction (Off-campus in Washington Co.) (Co-op w/Frostburg)
- M - Housing and Interior Environments
- M - Engineering Management (W/University College)
- M - Anthropology
- M - Russian
- M - Public Policy
  - Grad Cert - Analytical Skills
  - Grad Cert - Public Management
  - Grad Cert - National Security Studies
  - Grad Cert - Governmental and the Private Economy
- M - Toxicology (W/UMBC, UMAB, UMES)
- D - Toxicology (W/UMBC & UMAB)
- D - Family and Community Development
- Upper Div Cert - Healthful Living
- Upper Div Cert - East Asian Studies
- Upper Div Cert - Applied Social Sciences

1985-86
- BMD - Linguistics
- M - Arts Management
- M - Sports Management
- M - Classics
- D - Engineering
- M - Industrial Relations and Labor Studies

1986-87
- B - Engineering Materials
- B,M,D - Industrial and System Engineering
- MCS - Computer Science
- M - Agriculture
- M - Biometrics
- M - Historical Preservation
- M - Architectural History

1987-88
- M - Primate Ecology and Museum Technology

1988-89

TABLE 31

UMES

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Bachelors, Masters, Doctoral (only with other University campuses)

FUTURE AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: Arts and Science Core, Agriculture, Environmental Science, Technology, Allied Health

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
- B - Agri-Business
- B - General Studies
- M - Applied Computer Science
- M - Home Economics Extension
- M - Toxicology (W/UMCP, UMAB, UMBC)

1985-86
- B - Occupational Therapy
- M - Environmental Science Education
- M - Biological Sciences

1986-87
- B - Agricultural Mechanization

1987-88

1988-89

TABLE 32

UMUC

DEGREES TO BE OFFERED: Associate (to Active Duty Military), Bachelors, Masters

PROGRAMS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR DEVELOPMENT:

1984-85
M - Engineering Management (W/College Park)
M - Applied Communications Management (W/UMCP)

1985-86

1986-87

1987-88

1988-89

II. ENROLLMENTS

The major emphasis of enrollment planning has been on the distribution of new full-time freshmen among public four-year institutions. The 1978 Plan and 1979 Review contained freshman enrollment limitations at four campuses. Beginning with the 1980 Review, a freshman enrollment plan for all public four-year campuses has been included.

FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT PLAN

Table 33 shows the number of new full-time freshmen enrolled in Maryland institutions since 1980. The fall 1983 data is preliminary. In fall 1983, Maryland institutions enrolled 26,066 new full-time freshmen, which was very close to the number projected. This followed an unexpected decline in fall, 1982. The 1983 freshman enrollment levels suggest the possibility of an increase in the participation rate of Maryland high school graduates in Maryland institutions of higher education. This will not be determined until more detailed college data is available and the number of Maryland high school graduates for 1983 is released by the State Department of Education. Such an increase in the participation rate would be consistent with the assumption underlying the long-term freshman projections contained in the Plan.

The enrollment plan for freshmen is intended to help ensure an equitable sharing in the decline in freshmen and to encourage institutions to maintain or raise standards during a period of potentially increasing competition for students. While the Plan includes limitations for all public four-year institutions, the major impacts are at UMCP and Towson, where significant reductions in new freshmen are required. As shown in Table 33, most institutions were well below their limitations in 1983. Coppin and UMCP enrolled more freshmen (47 and 99, respectively) than called for in the Plan.

Table 34 is the freshman enrollment plan for the next 10 years. These projections continue to assume that Maryland public four-year institutions will begin to attract increasing numbers of academically able high school graduates who would typically leave the State to attend college. The enrollment plan will continue to be revised each year in light of relevant developments.

TOTAL ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Total enrollments in Maryland institutions of higher education increased in 1983 by 2.1% over the previous year (see Table 35). Enrollments at the undergraduate level were above projections while those for graduate/first-professional level were below. The 1983 total enrollment level was 13.9% higher

TABLE 33

NEW FULL-TIME STUDENTS

	1980	1981	1982	1983 (Pre-Lim.)	1983* Proj/ Limits
Comm. Coll.	11,243	11,654	11,090	11,059	10,905
BTSUC Instit.					
Bowie	293	281	256	282	337
Coppin	359	380	355	476	429
Frostburg	750	718	736	642	780
Salisbury	622	620	659	721	720
Towson	2,033	1,898	1,609	1,904	1,950
Total	4,057	3,897	3,615	4,025	4,216
Morgan	805	898	850	813	800
St. Mary's	303	319	320	284	400
University of Maryland					
UMBC	1,390	1,271	1,415	1,318	1,500
UMCP	4,596	4,362	4,189	4,399	4,300
UMES	229	308	274	247	360
UMUC	18	10	20	18	0
Total	6,233	5,951	5,898	5,982	6,150
Total Pub. 4-Year	11,398	11,065	10,683	11,104	11,576
Total Public	22,641	22,719	21,773	21,849	22,481
Independent Instit.	3,967	4,107	4,051	4,217	3,760
Total All Instit.	26,608	26,826	25,824	26,066	26,241
Maryland High School Graduating Seniors	61,367	60,893	61,578	58,621 (Est.)	
Ratio of Total Freshmen to Graduates	.432	.438	.419	.445	
Ratio of Maryland Freshmen to Graduates	.365	.371	.353	NA	

* Projections represent planning limits contained in the Statewide Plan for public four-year institutions and estimates for community colleges and independent institutions.

TABLE 34

ENROLLMENT PLAN
NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

University of Maryland

	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMUC	TOTAL
1980	1,390	4,596	229	18	6,233
1981	1,271	4,362	308	10	5,951
1982	1,415	4,189	274	20	5,898
1983*	1,318	4,399	247	18	5,982
1984	1,400	4,200	360	0	6,060
1985	1,400	4,100	370	0	5,960
1986	1,500	4,000	380	0	5,920
1987	1,500	4,000	390	0	5,880
1988	1,500	4,000	390	0	5,890
1989	1,500	4,000	400	0	5,890
1990	1,500	4,000	400	0	5,900
1991	1,500	4,000	400	0	5,900
1992	1,500	4,000	400	0	5,900
1993	1,500	4,000	400	0	5,900

BTSUC

	Bowie	Coppin	Frost	Salis	Towson	Total
1980	293	359	750	622	2,033	4,057
1981	281	380	718	620	1,898	3,897
1982	256	355	736	659	1,609	3,615
1983*	282	476	642	721	1,904	4,025
1984	330	420	760	700	1,800	4,010
1985	323	415	757	700	1,700	3,895
1986	316	410	751	700	1,700	3,877
1987	310	405	748	675	1,700	3,838
1988	305	400	746	675	1,700	3,826
1989	305	400	745	650	1,700	3,800
1990	305	400	744	650	1,700	3,799
1991	300	400	743	650	1,700	3,793
1992	300	400	742	650	1,700	3,792
1993	300	400	740	650	1,700	3,790

* Preliminary

TABLE 34 (Cont'd)

ENROLLMENT PLAN
NEW FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

	St. Mary's	Morgan	Total Public Colleges and Universities
1980	303	805	11,398
1981	319	898	11,065
1982	320	850	10,683
1983*	284	813	11,104
1984	350	800	11,120
1985	350	800	10,965
1986	350	800	10,907
1987	350	800	10,878
1988	350	800	10,866
1989	350	800	10,850
1990	350	800	10,849
1991	350	800	10,843
1992	350	800	10,842
1993	350	800	10,840

	Community Colleges	Independents	Total
1980	11,243	3,967	26,608
1981	11,654	4,107	26,826
1982	11,090	4,051	25,824
1983*	10,745	4,217	26,066
1984	10,788	3,650	25,558
1985	10,672	3,540	25,177
1986	10,484	3,450	24,841
1987	10,296	3,450	24,624
1988	10,113	3,650	24,629
1989	9,925	3,550	24,325
1990	9,738	3,550	24,137
1991	9,586	3,500	23,929
1992	9,586	3,500	23,928
1993	9,586	3,500	23,926

*Preliminary

TABLE 35

Enrollment Trends Since 1970

	Full-Time Undergraduate	Part-Time Undergraduate	Full-Time Grad./F. Prof.	Part-Time Grad./F. Prof.	Total
Fall 1970	80,780	45,149	8,791	12,807	147,527
1971	85,902	50,104	9,220	13,171	158,397
1972	88,499	56,279	10,063	14,005	168,846
1973	89,093	62,076	10,641	15,100	176,910
1974	94,043	66,144	10,425	16,560	187,172
1975	99,101	79,088	10,727	17,784	206,700
1976	99,607	80,879	10,634	19,587	209,707
1977	101,540	86,175	10,816	19,080	217,611
1978	97,117	88,715	10,598	19,360	215,790
1979	99,412	90,421	10,966	18,562	219,361
1980	100,141	95,521	11,007	19,247	225,916
1981	100,764	98,746	11,378	18,774	229,662
1982	101,059	102,991	11,465	18,470	233,985
1983	101,901	106,672	11,680	18,699	238,952
Change From Prior Year					
1970-1971	6.3%	11.0%	4.9%	2.8%	7.4%
1971-1972	3.0%	12.3%	9.1%	6.3%	6.6%
1972-1973	0.7%	10.3%	5.7%	7.8%	4.8%
1973-1974	5.6%	6.6%	-2.0%	9.7%	5.8%
1974-1975	5.4%	19.6%	2.9%	7.4%	10.4%
1975-1976	-0.5%	2.3%	-0.9%	10.1%	1.5%
1976-1977	3.0%	6.5%	1.7%	-2.6%	3.8%
1977-1978	-4.4%	2.9%	-2.0%	1.5%	-0.8%
1978-1979	2.4%	1.9%	3.5%	-4.1%	1.7%
1979-1980	0.7%	5.6%	0.4%	3.7%	3.0%
1980-1981	0.6%	3.4%	2.4%	-2.5%	1.6%
1981-1982	0.3%	4.3%	0.8%	-1.6%	1.8%
1982-1983	0.8%	3.6%	1.9%	1.2%	2.1%
% Change for Selected Periods					
1970-1976	23.3%	79.1%	21.0%	52.9%	42.1%
1976-1983	2.3%	31.9%	9.8%	-4.5%	13.9%

than in the mid-1970's and 42.1% higher than in 1970. While all categories of enrollments increased for the 1970-1983 period, growth has slowed in recent years. As shown in Table 36, projections for the next 10 years anticipate a continuation of the trend toward stability or decline in each category. Overall, enrollments are expected to decrease slightly during the 1984-1993 period, with a decline among full-time undergraduates. Tables 37-51 are projections for each public four-year campus as well as for community colleges as a group and independent institutions as a group.

TABLE 36

ENROLLMENTS-STATE TOTALS

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES
			(ACTUAL)			
80/81	100146	95529	11007	19247	225929	149412
81/82	100764	98747	11269	18774	229554	151207
82/83	101059	103004	11465	18470	233998	153015
			(PRELIMINARY)			
83/84	101901	106672	11680	18699	238952	155371
			(PROJECTIONS)			
84/85	101714	106060	11950	18925	238649	155326
85/86	101431	107179	12052	19154	239816	155594
86/87	101509	108124	12102	19339	241074	156099
87/88	101568	108986	12129	19479	242162	156519
88/89	101089	108689	12156	19573	241507	155999
89/90	100720	108352	12187	19774	241033	155616
90/91	100218	107940	12207	19917	240282	155044
91/92	99656	107422	12206	19997	239281	154335
92/93	99260	106954	12206	20047	238467	153800
93/94	99210	107504	12208	20079	239001	153946
PERCENTAGE CHANGE 1983-93	-2.64%	.78%	4.52%	7.38%	.02%	-.92%

TABLE 37

BOWIE STATE COLLEGE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
				(ACTUAL)				
80/81	1297	740	57	673	2767	1825	1788	1360
81/82	1216	664	63	601	2544	1701	1736	1311
82/83	1185	561	53	434	2233	1570	1610	1271
				(PRELIMINARY)				
83/84	1257	543	112	454	2366	1701	1700	1295
				(PROJECTIONS)				
84/85	1216	560	63	493	2332	1630	1700	1269
85/86	1200	598	62	490	2350	1625	1710	1248
86/87	1195	604	61	485	2345	1619	1705	1242
87/88	1190	610	60	480	2340	1613	1695	1236
88/89	1180	601	59	485	2325	1601	1675	1225
89/90	1170	601	58	486	2315	1590	1660	1214
90/91	1172	596	59	490	2317	1593	1662	1217
91/92	1180	590	60	495	2325	1602	1670	1226
92/93	1185	595	60	500	2340	1610	1675	1231
93/94	1185	595	60	500	2340	1610	1675	1231

TABLE 38

COPPIN STATE COLLEGE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
				(ACTUAL)				
80/81	1832	435	75	200	2542	2119	2040	1705
81/82	1554	437	40	203	2234	1807	1914	1439
82/83	1597	476	44	183	2300	1861	1937	1485
				(PRELIMINARY)				
83/84	1831	492	45	134	2502	2085	1860	1718
				(PROJECTIONS)				
84/85	1592	475	44	179	2290	1854	1900	1469
85/86	1584	473	44	179	2280	1845	1911	1462
86/87	1577	471	44	175	2267	1836	1899	1454
87/88	1569	469	42	173	2253	1825	1888	1445
88/89	1464	467	42	173	2146	1719	1882	1441
89/90	1571	469	42	169	2251	1826	1886	1444
90/91	1579	472	42	169	2262	1835	1895	1451
91/92	1582	472	42	174	2270	1839	1902	1456
92/93	1582	472	42	174	2270	1839	1902	1456
93/94	1582	472	42	174	2270	1839	1902	1456

TABLE 39

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
				(ACTUAL)				
80/81	2839	267	73	483	3662	3162	3181	2945
81/82	2810	268	57	474	3609	3114	3158	2857
82/83	2747	354	79	474	3654	3102	3095	2848
				(PRELIMINARY)				
83/84	2725	416	81	486	3708	3107	3156	2813
				(PROJECTIONS)				
84/85	2727	429	79	474	3709	3107	3100	2835
85/86	2699	431	79	474	3683	3080	3073	2810
86/87	2679	432	84	474	3669	3065	3058	2795
87/88	2662	434	84	480	3660	3051	3044	2778
88/89	2654	435	89	500	3678	3055	3048	2775
89/90	2646	435	89	495	3665	3045	3038	2767
90/91	2629	434	89	493	3645	3027	3020	2750
91/92	2615	433	87	490	3625	3010	3003	2734
92/93	2615	432	85	490	3622	3007	3000	2732
93/94	2615	432	85	490	3622	3007	3000	2732

TABLE 40

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
				(ACTUAL)				
80/81	3722	841	151	337	5051	4266	4367	4062
81/82	3618	606	177	291	4692	4094	4197	3882
82/83	3516	716	202	287	4721	4052	4031	3825
				(PRELIMINARY)				
83/84	3390	622	231	311	4554	3932	4000	3800
				(PROJECTIONS)				
84/85	3400	650	238	350	4638	3971	4029	3765
85/86	3425	675	240	375	4715	4015	4073	3807
86/87	3450	700	243	400	4793	4060	4119	3849
87/88	3475	725	246	410	4856	4099	4159	3887
88/89	3500	750	255	420	4925	4145	4205	3930
89/90	3500	750	288	430	4968	4181	4242	3964
90/91	3500	750	300	440	4990	4197	4258	3979
91/92	3500	750	300	450	5000	4200	4261	3982
92/93	3500	750	300	460	5010	4203	4264	3985
93/94	3500	750	300	470	5020	4207	4268	3988

TABLE 41

SALISBURY STATE COLLEGE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	2879	816	40	583	4318	3385	3296	2840
81/82	2914	869	43	526	4352	3422	3293	2909
82/83	2988	853	44	456	4341	3468	3326	2967
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	3056	914	33	485	4488	3555	3316	3022
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	3066	894	45	510	4515	3579	3316	2990
85/86	2998	875	44	499	4416	3500	3309	2893
86/87	2998	875	44	499	4416	3500	3309	2983
87/88	2990	872	44	498	4404	3491	3300	2975
88/89	2990	872	44	498	4404	3491	3300	2975
89/90	2963	865	44	492	4364	3459	3270	2948
90/91	2954	862	44	491	4351	3449	3260	2939
91/92	2936	857	43	488	4324	3427	3240	2921
92/93	2918	851	43	485	4297	3406	3220	2903
93/94	2918	851	43	485	4297	3406	3220	2903

TABLE 42

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	1105	244	0	0	1349	1186	1240	1112
81/82	1115	214	0	0	1329	1186	1229	1087
82/83	1098	198	0	0	1296	1164	1233	1130
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	1110	220	0	0	1330	1183	1250	1145
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	1075	235	0	0	1310	1153	1240	1086
85/86	1065	235	0	0	1300	1143	1197	1076
86/87	1065	235	0	0	1300	1143	1197	1076
87/88	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067
88/89	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067
89/90	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067
90/91	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067
91/92	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067
92/93	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067
93/94	1055	235	0	0	1290	1133	1186	1067

TABLE 43

TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	9633	4484	131	1280	15528	11685	10996	9825
81/82	9410	4388	124	1201	15123	11397	10822	9664
82/83	9119	4432	124	1183	14858	11115	10583	9451
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	9350	4625	130	1050	15155	11372	10700	9514
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	9397	4583	123	1178	15281	11440	10600	9466
85/86	9080	4661	128	1197	15066	11161	10400	9287
86/87	8906	4687	129	1216	14938	11003	10200	9109
87/88	8755	4713	130	1235	14833	10868	10100	9019
88/89	8621	4728	130	1246	14725	10742	10000	8930
89/90	8585	4732	130	1251	14698	10709	10000	8930
90/91	8437	4719	129	1253	14538	10557	9800	8751
91/92	8291	4689	128	1252	14360	10399	9700	8662
92/93	8166	4660	128	1252	14206	10265	9600	8573
93/94	8166	4660	128	1252	14206	10265	9600	8573

TABLE 44

UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	1007	1872	1029	1442	5350	3141	3022	1516
81/82	1001	1670	1165	1470	5306	3213	3111	1625
82/83	1006	1705	1192	1476	5379	3258	3177	1654
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	990	1661	1154	1383	5188	3159	3136	1649
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	960	1705	1185	1522	5372	3221	3164	1645
85/86	969	1711	1192	1590	5462	3261	3168	1562
86/87	952	1752	1191	1609	5504	3263	3173	1590
87/88	931	1776	1190	1631	5528	3257	3168	1612
88/89	918	1784	1185	1631	5518	3241	3148	1616
89/90	900	1796	1175	1631	5502	3217	3130	1622
90/91	880	1790	1175	1631	5476	3195	3110	1619
91/92	880	1790	1175	1631	5476	3195	3110	1619
92/93	880	1790	1175	1631	5476	3195	3110	1619
93/94	880	1790	1175	1631	5476	3195	3110	1619

TABLE 45

UM BALTIMORE CITY

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	1159	160	2675	854	4848	4172	4624	4099
81/82	1199	147	2706	846	4898	4236	4662	4149
82/83	1134	135	2725	806	4800	4173	4410	4103
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	1046	89	2654	893	4682	4027	4535	4226
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	1007	74	2874	781	4736	4166	4393	4194
85/86	1008	74	2845	784	4711	4139	4348	4166
86/87	1008	74	2832	785	4699	4126	4331	4149
87/88	1008	74	2832	786	4700	4127	4331	4149
88/89	1008	74	2832	786	4700	4127	4331	4149
89/90	1008	74	2832	787	4701	4127	4331	4149
90/91	1008	74	2832	787	4701	4127	4331	4149
91/92	1008	74	2832	788	4702	4127	4331	4149
92/93	1008	74	2832	788	4702	4127	4331	4149
93/94	1008	74	2832	788	4702	4127	4331	4149

TABLE 46

UM BALTIMORE COUNTY

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	4637	1191	128	351	6307	5279	5265	4926
81/82	4874	1459	168	259	6760	5615	5671	5182
82/83	5451	1495	185	253	7384	6219	6058	5336
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	5685	1778	185	338	7986	6575	5900	5469
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	5708	1802	160	296	7966	6567	6400	5517
85/86	5917	1972	170	316	8375	6850	6700	5754
86/87	6140	2047	198	365	8750	7142	7000	5999
87/88	6315	2109	205	371	9000	7347	7200	6171
88/89	6400	2167	210	382	9159	7460	7400	6266
89/90	6400	2281	210	390	9281	7500	7500	6300
90/91	6400	2281	210	390	9281	7500	7500	6300
91/92	6400	2281	210	390	9281	7500	7500	6300
92/93	6400	2281	210	390	9281	7500	7500	6300
93/94	6400	2281	210	390	9281	7500	7500	6300

TABLE 47

UM COLLEGE PARK

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	25100	5214	2706	4844	37864	31159	30151	29407
81/82	24822	5180	2786	4740	37528	30915	29844	28856
82/83	24305	5259	2816	4666	37046	30429	29518	29513
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	24797	4713	3080	4823	37413	31056	29736	28491
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	24320	5480	2952	4673	37425	30656	29228	28096
85/86	24230	5470	2986	4710	37396	30609	29536	28059
86/87	24125	5465	3009	4758	37357	30542	29482	28008
87/88	24050	5455	3024	4812	37341	30496	29449	27977
88/89	23990	5445	3033	4846	37314	30453	29421	27450
89/90	23875	5430	3039	5008	37352	30393	29373	27904
90/91	23785	5415	3044	5108	37352	30337	29328	27861
91/92	23715	5390	3046	5170	37321	30281	29281	27822
92/93	23650	5400	3048	5208	37306	30234	29259	27796
93/94	23600	5400	3050	5230	37280	30193	29214	27750

TABLE 48

UM EASTERN SHORE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	831	180	4	58	1073	914	908	872
81/82	909	160	7	53	1129	987	991	922
82/83	966	184	8	56	1214	1054	1072	1012
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	960	200	5	58	1223	1051	988	991
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	971	269	24	153	1417	1136	1088	1085
85/86	1007	306	29	188	1530	1201	1231	1146
86/87	1042	337	34	215	1628	1260	1285	1203
87/88	1077	370	39	242	1728	1320	1240	1261
88/89	1112	401	44	245	1802	1371	1392	1317
89/90	1147	404	47	274	1872	1420	1442	1370
90/91	1182	410	50	304	1946	1470	1500	1429
91/92	1182	410	50	320	1962	1475	1500	1429
92/93	1182	410	50	320	1962	1475	1500	1429
93/94	1182	410	50	320	1962	1475	1500	1429

TABLE 49

UM UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	685	10067	10	622	11384	4258	N.A.	N.A.
81/82	691	10049	18	495	11253	4224	N.A.	N.A.
82/83	762	9924	6	582	11274	4270	N.A.	N.A.
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	731	10069	53	714	11567	4378	N.A.	N.A.
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	769	10222	13	627	11631	4398	N.A.	N.A.
85/86	781	10377	13	636	11807	4465	N.A.	N.A.
86/87	789	10479	13	643	11924	4509	N.A.	N.A.
87/88	792	10528	13	646	11979	4530	N.A.	N.A.
88/89	795	10528	13	648	11984	4533	N.A.	N.A.
89/90	795	10563	13	648	12019	4545	N.A.	N.A.
90/91	795	10568	13	648	12024	4547	N.A.	N.A.
91/92	796	10571	13	649	12029	4549	N.A.	N.A.
92/93	796	10576	13	649	12034	4551	N.A.	N.A.
93/94	796	10576	13	649	12034	4551	N.A.	N.A.

TABLE 50

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	28978	64049	0	0	93027	50328	N.A.	N.A.
81/82	29886	66675	0	0	96561	52111	N.A.	N.A.
82/83	30641	70921	0	0	101562	54281	N.A.	N.A.
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	30130	74539	0	0	104669	54976	N.A.	N.A.
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	31006	72657	0	0	103663	55225	N.A.	N.A.
85/86	31268	73271	0	0	104539	55692	N.A.	N.A.
86/87	31533	73891	0	0	105424	56163	N.A.	N.A.
87/88	31799	74516	0	0	106315	56638	N.A.	N.A.
88/89	31602	74052	0	0	105654	56286	N.A.	N.A.
89/90	31405	73592	0	0	104997	55936	N.A.	N.A.
90/91	31210	73134	0	0	104344	55588	N.A.	N.A.
91/92	31016	72680	0	0	103696	55243	N.A.	N.A.
92/93	30823	72228	0	0	103051	54899	N.A.	N.A.
93/94	30823	72778	0	0	103601	55082	N.A.	N.A.

TABLE 51

INDEPENDENTS

FALL/ FY	UNDERGRAD FT	UNDERGRAD PT	GRAD/PROF FT	GRAD/PROF PT	TOTAL	FALL HDCT FTES	FY BUDG FTES	FALL FTDES
			(ACTUAL)					
80/81	14442	4969	3928	7520	30859	22533	N.A.	N.A.
81/82	14745	5961	3915	7615	32236	23185	N.A.	N.A.
82/83	14544	5791	3987	7614	31936	22999	N.A.	N.A.
			(PRELIMINARY)					
83/84	14843	5791	3917	7570	32121	23214	N.A.	N.A.
			(PROJECTIONS)					
84/85	14500	6025	4150	7689	32364	23221	N.A.	N.A.
85/86	14200	6050	4220	7716	32186	23009	N.A.	N.A.
86/87	14050	6075	4220	7715	32060	22867	N.A.	N.A.
87/88	13900	6100	4220	7715	31935	22725	N.A.	N.A.
88/89	13800	6150	4220	7713	31883	22641	N.A.	N.A.
89/90	13700	6125	4220	7713	31758	22533	N.A.	N.A.
90/91	13632	6200	4220	7713	31765	22490	N.A.	N.A.
91/92	13500	6200	4220	7700	31620	22353	N.A.	N.A.
92/93	13500	6200	4220	7700	31620	22353	N.A.	N.A.
93/94	13500	6200	4220	7700	31620	22353	N.A.	N.A.

III. PROGRAMS

The major objectives of the Plan in the area of Academic Programs are to maintain and improve quality, avoid unnecessary duplication, selectively deal with access problems, and develop programs at underenrolled campuses.

ACCESS TO PART-TIME AND EVENING GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The Plan recommends that the University of Maryland increase program offerings for part-time and evening graduate students, particularly at the UMCP campus.

Status

Table 52 shows trends in part-time graduate enrollments for the past five years at each campus of the University of Maryland. For the University as a whole the number of part-time graduate students has remained relatively stable and made up over 60% of total graduate enrollments. Part-time enrollments have increased at UMAB, UMES, and UMUC while declining slightly at UMBC and UMCP. At UMAB, UMBC, and UMCP, part-time doctoral program enrollments are higher than they were five years ago (see Table 16, Chapter I). Since the Plan was adopted UMES has begun to offer graduate study and UMUC has fully implemented a graduate program. Both programs enroll primarily part-time students.

Assessment

Even though there have not been gains in part-time graduate enrollments at UMCP, over 60% of graduate students on the campus are part-time, which is high compared to most other major doctoral-granting research universities. The increase in part-time doctoral enrollments at that campus as well as at UMAB and UMBC is an indication that the University is providing increased access in an area in which it has a unique role in the State. This along with the consistent growth that has taken place on the other campuses suggest that the University is providing a relatively high level of access to graduate study on a part-time basis.

PROGRAMS FOR REGISTERED NURSES

The Plan recommends that public colleges and universities offering baccalaureate programs in nursing ensure their programs adequately serve registered nurses desiring to complete bachelors degrees.

Status

All public institutions offering bachelors programs in nursing now have made provisions for serving registered nurses

TABLE 52

TRENDS IN PART-TIME GRADUATE STUDENTS
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

	Fall 1978	Fall 1979	Fall 1980	Fall 1981	Fall 1982
UMAB					
No. Part-Time	645	691	790	778	770
% Total Grad. Enr.	49%	51%	54%	53%	54%
UMBC					
No. Part-Time	303	269	351	259	253
% Total Grad. Enr.	76%	69%	73%	61%	58%
UMCP					
No. Part-Time	4920	4776	4844	4740	4666
% Total Grad. Enr.	66%	65%	64%	63%	62%
UMES					
No. Part-Time	33	38	58	53	56
% Total Grad. Enr.	92%	79%	94%	88%	88%
UMUC					
No. Part-Time	384	562	622	495	582
% Total Grad. Enr.	96%	94%	98%	96%	99%
All Univ. of Maryland					
No. Part-Time	6285	6336	6[illegible]5	6325	6327
% Total Grad. Enr.	66%	65%	64%	63%	63%

seeking the baccalaureate. Table 53 shows the number of registered nurses enrolled in baccalaureate programs at public four-year campuses. The number of registered nurses enrolled in baccalaureate programs in 1982 was below the 1980 and 1981 levels, although 1982 was the highest of the three years in terms of total nursing enrollments.

Assessment

The trends in enrollments of registered nurses indicate no gains in access, at least compared to students training for initial entry into the profession. The Task Force on Nursing Education, which resulted from the Report of the Governor's Commission on Nursing Issues, is studying the general issue of nursing education. Its report, which will deal with education of registered nurses, is due in mid-1984.

UTILIZING INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND THE SREB ACADEMIC COMMON MARKET

The Statewide Plan provides that Maryland, to the extent possible, take advantage of programs available through interstate contractual arrangements and the Academic Common Market of the SREB; and that the SBHE take into account programs available through such arrangements in reviewing proposals for new programs.

No programs were approved this past years which were available though either contractual arrangements or the SREB Academic Common Market.

PROGRAMS FOR HIGH ABILITY STUDENTS

The Statewide Plan provides for all public four-year institutions to develop or improve programs designed to attract high ability students. This recommendation was intended to enable Maryland public four-year institutions to compete better for students with high academic ability, large numbers of whom historically have left the State to attend college.

University of Maryland

UMCP. The General Honors Program at UMCP has been in existence since 1965. During the 1982-83 academic year it enrolled about 1300 academically talented students. Its purpose is to broaden the students' general education at a challenging level through academic and social experiences. In addition there are over thirty Departmental or College Honors Programs available for students who wish to do specialized honors work in their chosen field.

The General Honors Program is stressing articulation with programs for gifted and talented students in the Maryland Public School system at the high school, junior high school and

TABLE 53

REGISTERED NURSES ENROLLED IN
BACCALAUREATE NURSING PROGRAMS

Institution	1980			1981			1982		
	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT	Total
Bowie									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	12	61	73	33	92	125	25	89	114
Total Nursing Enrollment	12	61	73	33	92	125	25	89	114
Coppin									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	13	28	41	4	15	19	9	16	25
Total Nursing Enrollment	125	42	167	94	41	135	103	62	165
Salisbury									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	19	11	30	12	9	21	9	12	21
Total Nursing Enrollment	137	26	163	257	71	328	310	63	373
Towson									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	2	6	8	14	4	18	7	2	9
Total Nursing Enrollment	363	27	390	355	48	403	361	63	373
UMAB									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	75	72	147	73	60	133	45	52	97
Total Nursing Enrollment	638	113	751	681	105	786	632	94	726
UMBC									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	NO PROGRAM			NO PROGRAM			0	0	0
Total Nursing Enrollment	NO PROGRAM			NO PROGRAM			47	1	48
Total									
No. Reg. Nurses Enrolled	121	178	299	136	180	316	95	171	266
Total Nursing Enrollment	1275	269	1544	1420	357	1777	1478	352	1830

elementary school level. Each summer it offers, in cooperation with the Maryland State Department of Education, a Center for Creative Writing in the Humanities for about 300 gifted and talented junior high school students. Other activities include mini-courses taught by General Honors Program undergraduate students for gifted and talented elementary school students and a series of seminars and other activities for high school students and their parents.

In recent years, the UMCP campus has substantially increased the amount of financial aid awarded to high ability students. Scholarship aid in the amount of $467,000 was awarded to academically talented undergraduate students in 1982-83. About 600 undergraduates are expected to be awarded close to $500,000 in merit-based aid in 1983-84. Some of the major programs are summarized below.

College Park enrolled 82 National Merit Scholars and 13 National Achievement Scholars in 1982-83. The campus is expecting 29 new National Merit and 6 new National achievement Scholars in 1983-84. These students receive a tuition-rebate scholarship of $500 renewable for four years provided that an appropriate level of academic performance is maintained.

The Chancellor's Scholars Program and the Community College Scholars Program provides full resident tuition and fee remission. In the fall of 1982, 28 freshmen and five community college transfer students brought the total number of participants in this scholarship program to 104. The campus is expecting 25 freshmen and three transfer students to join this group of scholars in 1983-84.

Benjamin Banneker Scholarships, initiated in the fall of 1979, are awarded to academically talented minority students. Twenty-one new freshmen were added in 1982-83 bringing to 69 the number of students receiving awards, each of which covered the cost of resident tuition and fees. The campus expects to make awards to 20 new freshmen in 1983-84.

Eighty-four one-year scholarships of $500 each are awarded to students in either General Honors or in a departmental honors program. Some are awarded to high ability incoming freshmen, some to students already in the honors programs. They are renewable provided that the student maintains a 3.2 GPA and makes satisfactory progress towards an honors citation either in the General Honors Program or in a departmental honors program.

Other awards for academically talented undergraduate students include the Creative and Performing Arts Scholarship students with artistic talent, and the Kelly Scholarship for academically precocious high school students. Fifteen Creative and Performing Arts Scholarships, each covering resident tuition and fees, were awarded in 1982-83, bringing the total to 30. Fifteen additional awards will be made in 1983-84. Two Kelly

Scholarships, each valued at $1,000, were awarded to precocious high school students in 1981-82.

UMES. UMES initiated a joint honors program with UMAB during the fall of 1979. The program is designed to provide assured admission to the UMAB professional schools for students successfully completing the pre-professional honors program. A general honors program was initiated in fall 1982. In fall 1982, 52 entering freshmen were enrolled compared to 41 in fall 81. In 1982-83, a total of 117 students were enrolled, 79 within the pre-professional honors program and 38 within the general honors program. Enrollment for 1983-84 should exceed 130 students. The general honors program will be expanded in fall 1983. Affiliations with several graduate and professional schools, in addition to UMAB, will be sought during the ensuing year. Fifty-six of the students enrolled in the program received aid ranging from $500 to full tuition, room, board, and books. A total of $98,255 in financial aid was awarded to honor students during 1982-83.

UMBC. UMBC began both general and departmental honors programs in 1981. The general program is for lower division students while the departmental programs are for juniors and seniors. Entering students who have combined SAT scores of 1100 or high school GPA's of 3.5 are eligible for the general program. In 1982, 620 students participated in either the general program or a departmental honors program. Projections are for 700 participants in 1983.

UMBC offers both Chancellor's Merit and Scholastic Achievement scholarships to incoming freshmen and transfers. The Chancellor's Merit Scholarship, a renewable award of $750 per year, was awarded to 25 freshmen and 5 transfers in Fall 1982 (total - $22,500 awarded). About the same numbers and amounts will be awarded in Fall 1983. The Scholastic Achievement Award, also a renewable award of $750 per year, is designed to recognize academically talented freshmen and transfer minority students. In Fall 1982, 21 freshmen and 7 transfer minority students benefited from this award (total $21,000 awarded). Similar numbers and amounts are expected to be awarded in Fall 1983.

St. Mary's

St. Mary's initiated its honors program in the fall of 1979. The curriculum of the program was revised and the new curriculum implemented in fall, 1982. All honors students now complete a core of four honors courses; one course is taken in each of the first four semesters. Proficiency in written English, mathematics, and a foreign language is also required. Juniors and seniors in the program may participate in independent study, internships, and/or study abroad. Seniors are required to complete an honors project which is supervised by a faculty project director and a committee of faculty

members. In the fall of 1982 St. Mary's enrolled 56 entering and returning students in its honors program. In 1981 the number was 59, in 1980 39, and in 1979 22. In the fall of 1983 it is anticipated that 73 entering and returning students will participate in the program. Participants in the program are eligible for State-funded scholarships which range from tuition alone to tuition, room, and board. A special program has been established for high ability minority students who receive State-funded scholarships and may participate in the honors curriculum as well. Offers of scholarship assistance have been made to 28 members of the entering class of 1987. Six of them are minority students. The average SAT's for those granted admission for the fall of 1983 are 1200. They range from a high of 1470 to a low of 1100. In fall 1982, 67 honors students received over $223,280 in merit financial aid. Projections are for this to increase slightly in 1983.

Morgan

The University Honors Program is and has been since 1974 the broad umbrella under which all honors-related activities at Morgan State fall. It includes: (a) a General Honors Program; (b) Departmental Honors Program; (c) a network of honor societies; (d) Curricular and extra-curricular honors activities; and (e) Scholarship Programs, all coordinated through the Office of the Honors Program Director. All of these components aim at attracting high ability students and involving them in challenging and intellectually fulfilling activities. Standards for the Honors Program are uniform throughout the University, and the program involves full-time undergraduates in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and Management, the School of Education and Urban Affairs.

The General Honors Program is a four-year curriculum which admits incoming freshmen with above-average high school grades and high SAT scores and upper-freshmen and upper-classmen who have earned cumulative averages of 3.0 or higher.

During AY1982, 66 awards amounting to $100,000 were made to high ability students. Ninety-five awards totaling $150,000 are projected for AY1983.

State Colleges and Universities

The Board of Trustees established a scholarship, entitled "The Board of Trustees Outstanding Scholar Award" in 1982. An award of $500 will be granted each Spring session to a second semester junior enrolled in the honors program at each of the six institutions to help defray the awardee's tuition costs in his/her senior year. The awards were presented for the first time in May 1982.

Bowie. The Honors Program at Bowie State College consists of General College Honors and Departmental Honors. Currently 50

students participate in the General College Honors Program and additional students are enrolled in Departmental Honors. The program encompasses the entire four years in which the student is enrolled. The first two years are devoted to honors sections of the general education requirements. The last two years involve directed readings and an honors thesis or project under the direction of a faculty member. Efforts are being undertaken to attract additional students to the program through scholarships and other incentives. Funds were received from the Board of Trustees for eight scholarship recipients at $1,220 each per year.

Coppin. During AY1982 thirty-nine (39) students participated in the Coppin State College Honors Program. Twenty-five (25) students enrolled in the General Studies Honors Program, the component designed to provide freshmen and sophomores with advanced general education course placements as substitutes for basic general education courses. The total number of AY1982 General Studies Honors participants represents significant growth; only nine (9) students participated in this component during AY1981. During AY1983, the College Honors Committee plans to offer students additional options for completing the General Studies Honors Program. These alternatives include honors sections of courses, contracts to complete additional coursework in regular classes, and independent research. During AY1982 fourteen (14) students participated in the Departmental Honors Program, the component that is designed for academically outstanding juniors and seniors.

During AY1982 thirty-seven (37) of the thirty-nine (39) participants in the Honors Program received financial aid. During AY1983 virtually all high-ability students should receive financial aid. Some will receive High-Ability Scholarships (provided by the State Board of Trustees). One will receive the Board Outstanding Scholar Award ($500). Others will receive Presidential Scholarships (tuition waivers), private-donor scholarships, and/or other financial assistance. The average amount of financial aid awards should be approximately $1,900.

Frostburg. The honors program at Frostburg was initiated during 1981-82. Two departments also have developed departmental honors programs. Students who have met the general education honors course requirements and/or the departmental honors requirements are recognized at an Honors Convocation and at Commencement. Future plans call for continued refinement of the curriculum and increased marketing of the program to both potential students and the surrounding communities. Efforts also will be made to identify funds for support of independent research.

During 1983 Frostburg anticipates offering a total of forty scholarships having a combined value of over $21,000 to high ability students. Nineteen of these will be foundation

scholarships, 13 will be from individual donations, and 8 from BTSUC.

Salisbury. The Honors Program at Salisbury State College offers several courses each semester for approximately 100 students in the program. These are small discussion classes, some of which are interdisciplinary, which have as their primary goal the promotion of independent thinking and learning. Students who so choose may take a general honors degree by achieving a 3.3 GPA in ten honors courses, including the senior honors seminar and the senior honors thesis.

Seventy-six students registered for honors courses in 1982. This year the program will open an honors dormitory and lounge. The dorm will house 16 students and the adjacent lounge will serve as a social/cultural/intellectural center for the honors community. The Program has also awarded its first merit scholarships this year - awards of $500 each to the two outstanding freshmen in the program.

Towson. Though Towson has had an honors program for several years the Honors College approach was implemented during 1981-82 to provide honors level study in meeting the general education requirements of high ability students. A primary objective was to involve the gifted student to a greater extent than normal in the student's own learning process through seminar and/or discussion type courses. The courses are designed with a strong liberal arts emphasis and fulfill, for the most part, the General University requirements. Satisfactory completion of five or more honors courses will result in recognition at graduation. The departmental honors program is designed for the upper division high ability student and provides the student with an intensive, directed and individualized educational experience in his/her major field of study. An honors thesis culminating in an oral examination is required for all departmental honors students. The theses are published when sufficient material has accumulated to complete a volume. Ten departments are currently participating in the departmental honors program. Towson provides modest stipends for non-course related projects involving independent research. Partial scholarships are provided meritorious students who qualify as Presidential Fellows.

University of Baltimore. Since the University is an upper division institution, the honors program has been designed to meet the needs of gifted students at the junior and senior levels. In AY1982, honors activities included two honors seminars, individual honors research projects, honor research assistantships, and an honors monograph. This year, in addition, a thoroughly revised honors program was approved by the curricular bodies of the College of Liberal Arts and by the Faculty Senate. This new integrated four course honors program consists of 6 credits in interdisciplinary honors seminars and 6 credits of independent study culminating in an honors thesis and

public presentation. It is intended to provide students with an exceptional education that both broadens a student's perspective and teaches the rigors of specialization. In addition, students may continue to apply for funding to carry out individual research projects or work with faculty as junior members of a research team. While qualified students may continue to enroll in particular honors seminars, beginning in Fall 1983 they will also have the option of entering the integrated honors program and will then be eligible to graduate with Collegiate Honors in the College of Liberal Arts. A committee in the School of Business has been developing during AY82-83 an honors program to be implemented either in the spring of 1984 or the fall of 1985. The plan will be reviewed by the faculty during the fall semester of 1983.

Assessment

All public four-year institutions have either implemented or expanded honors programs for high ability students during the past few years. These should in the long run improve the ability of these campuses to attract high ability students. Increased State support will be necessary as these programs develop.

Two general indicators are used to monitor the effectiveness of these and other programs in reversing the flow of high ability students from the State.

High School Seniors. Table 54 shows the college plans of public high school seniors for the past five years. Between 1978 and 1981, the percentage of college-bound high school seniors leaving the State increased from 27% to 29% and the percentage of A students leaving increased from 46% to 52%. In 1982 29% of all students again intended to leave the State. However, the percentage of A students intending to leave Maryland decreased slightly. The results of the Spring 1983 survey are not yet available.

SBHE Survey of Semifinalists. For the past five years the SBHE has conducted a survey of Maryland high school seniors who were National Merit and National Achievement Semifinalists to determine their college plans and the reasons for their decisions. These represent the highest achieving students in the State in terms of performance on the Scholastic Aptitude test. The results for the past five years are shown in Table 55. During these five years the percentage of respondents who indicated that they intended to remain in the State has fluctuated within a fairly narrow range, 10-16%, with no trend apparent. This survey has consistently found that those students leaving the State are attracted by institutional prestige, high admissions standards and honors programs. The size of UMCP is frequently indicated as a disadvantage for that campus. Each of these areas has become the focus of institutional attention during the past few years in their

TABLE 54

COLLEGE PLANS OF MARYLAND PUBLIC
HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS BY AVERAGE GRADE

	A	B	C	D	Total
			1978		
% Staying in State	54%	73%	81%	83%	73%
% Leaving State	46%	27%	19%	17%	27%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			1979		
% Staying in State	53%	73%	80%	76%	72%
% Leaving State	47%	27%	20%	24%	28%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			1980		
% Staying in State	51%	72%	79%	78%	72%
% Leaving State	49%	28%	21%	22%	28%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			1981		
% Staying in State	48%	71%	79%	79%	71%
% Leaving State	52%	29%	21%	21%	29%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			1982		
% Staying in State	49%	71%	79%	79%	71%
% Leaving State	51%	29%	21%	21%	29%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Maryland State Department of Education
High School Exit Survey

TABLE 55

COLLEGE PLANS OF 1982 MARYLAND
NATIONAL MERIT AND NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT
SEMI-FINALISTS

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Institutions Located in Maryland					
State Institutions					
UMBC	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.4%
UMCP	7.6%	12.7%	8.4%	13.3%	10.4%
UMES	0.6%	-	1.3%	-	-
Salisbury	-	-	-	1.1%	-
St. Mary's	-	-	0.6%	-	-
Towson	0.6%	-	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%
Subtotal-St. Instit.	9.9%	13.4%	11.6%	15.6%	12.5%
Independent Institutions					
Columbia Union	0.6%	0.6%	-	-	-
Goucher	-	-	-	0.6%	0.7%
Hood	0.6%	-	-	-	-
Johns Hopkins	4.1%	8.9%	8.4%	5.0%	5.6%
Loyola	1.7%	2.5%	1.3%	-	-
Notre Dame	-	-	0.6%	0.6%	-
St. John's	-	-	0.6%	0.6%	-
Washington	-	-	-	0.6%	0.7%
Subtotal-Ind. Instit.	7.0%	13.3%	11.0%	7.2%	6.9%
U.S. Naval Academy	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	1.1%	-
Total - All Institutions Located in Maryland	17.4%	27.4%	23.9%	23.9%	19.4%
Public	9.3%	14.6%	11.0%	18.3%	14.6%
Private	73.3%	58.0%	65.2%	57.8%	66.0%
Total All Institutions in Other States	82.6%	72.6%	76.1%	76.1%	80.6%
GRAND TOTAL	172 (100%)	157 (100%)	155 (100%)	180 (100%)	144 (100%)

efforts to attract increasing numbers of high ability students. It is obvious, however, that because these students are sophisticated in making their college plans and are highly recruited, reversing this long-established trend is not going to be easy.

PROGRAMS AND COURSES AT OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS

The Statewide Plan requires that new off-campus programs be submitted to SBHE for review; it also provides for the collection and publication of data for off-campus programs offered each academic session, as well as for the submission of a copy of all promotional materials for such courses provided to the public in order to monitor off-campus offerings.

Status

Beginning with the Spring, 1979 term, the SBHE began collecting these data from all in-State and out-of-State institutions operating in Maryland. Reports are published periodically and institutional responses are available for inspection.

DOCTORAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The Plan provides that future doctoral program development be limited to institutions currently offering the doctorate and to Morgan State University, which may develop doctoral programs having an urban focus and meeting clearly identified urban needs. Development of cooperative programs between doctoral centers and institutions not granting the doctorate is encouraged in order to ensure an adequate level of access and to maintain quality. Development of doctoral proposals by other institutions is not encouraged. However, proposals for doctoral programs from other institutions will be considered by SBHE and may be approved or receive a positive recommendation in exceptional circumstances when such a program clearly would be unique within the State and would meet a high priority need.

Status

The SBHE has not approved or endorsed any proposals for doctoral programs at other than the doctoral-granting institutions designated in the Statewide Plan, adopted in 1978.

CERTIFICATES OF ADVANCED STUDY

The Plan provides that programs leading to certificates of advanced study be offered by institutions in fields in which they award the doctorate. New programs leading to certificates of advanced study also may be offered by institutions which award only the masters degree, providing that such programs are offered in cooperation with a doctoral-granting institution and that courses taken in such a program can be credited toward a

doctoral degree at the cooperating doctoral-granting institution in the event that a student desires to complete work on a doctorate.

Status

Since adoption of the Plan, the Board has approved one CAS program at a non-doctoral granting campus under this arrangement. During AY1981-82 Towson was approved to award the Certificate of Advanced Study in School Psychology. This program is articulated with doctoral programs in Applied Developmental Psychology at UMBC and UMCP.

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS

Table 56 indicates those programs approved and endorsed from July 1982 through June 1983. In addition, the Board also reviewed a number of requests to discontinue programs. Those that were approved or endorsed by SBHE for discontinuance are listed in Table 57.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AT BOWIE, UMES, AND UMBC

The Plan recommends increased emphasis on program development at Bowie, UMES, and UMBC in order to increase their attractiveness and thereby improve their enrollment prospects.

Status

Since 1976, 35 new programs have been approved for these three campuses (UMBC - 16, UMES - 12, Bowie - 7). These represent about one-third of the new programs approved at all public four-year institutions during this period.

One of the specific recommendations of the Plan that has not been implemented is for the University of Baltimore to establish a branch of its law school at the Bowie campus to serve part-time students. The Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges deferred planning on implementing this recommendation until the University of Baltimore received full ABA accreditation. Following receipt of full accreditation, the Board of Trustees initiated a study of the feasibility of a branch at Bowie. It concluded that because of the prospect of continuing funding limitations such a branch should not be established.

Assessment

The Board of Trustees appears to have taken a realistic view of the prospects for maintaining and improving the quality of the University of Baltimore's Law School while at the same time attempting to expand its operations to another location. Further consideration of this proposal is not warranted for the reasons detailed in their report.

TABLE 56

NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS APPROVED OR ENDORSED
JULY 1982 - JUNE 1983

Institution	Program Title	Degree	Date
July, 1982			
UMCP	Food, Nutrition & Instit Mgmt	PhD	Fall 82
UMCP/Frostburg	Curriculum & Instruction-Off-campus, Outreach Pgrm	EdD	Fall 82
Western Md. College	Studies in Communication	BA	Spr. 83
November, 1982			
Washington College	Business Management	BA	Spr. 83
Wash. Theol. Union	Theological Studies	MTS	Fall 82
January, 1983			
Frostburg	Computer Science	BS	Fall 83
Towson	Computer Science	BS	Spr. 83
UMBC	Applied Molecular Biology	BA/MS & MS	Spr. 83
Capitol Inst of Tech	Telecommunications	BS,AA, & Cert	Fall 83
	Computer Engineering Tech	BS,AA, & Cert	Fall 83
Peabody	Record. Arts & Sciences	BM	Fall 83
Villa Julie	Computer Studies	AA	Fall 83
March, 1983			
Catonsville	Computer Service Technology	AA&Cert	Fall 83
Charles Co. CC	Early Childhood Education	Cert	Fall 83
	Nautical Science	Cert	Fall 83
Chesapeake CC	Industrial Mechanics Tech	Cert	Fall 83
Dundalk CC	Computer Programming	AA	Fall 83
	Industrial Maintenance Tech	AA	Fall 83
	Ornamental Horticulture	AA	Fall 83
Garrett CC	Gerontology	Cert	Fall 83
Prince George's CC	Para-Legal/Legal Assistant	AA&Cert	Fall 83
Wor-Wic Tech	Computer Programming	AA&Cert	Fall 83

TABLE 56 (Cont'd)

NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS APPROVED OR ENDORSED
JULY 1982 - JUNE 1983

Institution	Program Title	Degree	Implem. Date
March, 1983, Cont'd			
UMCP	Community Health Education	BS	Fall 83
	East Asian Languages & Lit	BA	Fall 83
Mt. St. Mary's	Science Education	BS	Fall 83
Notre Dame	International Studies	BA	Fall 83
May, 1983			
Chesapeake CC	Radiologic Technology	AA	Fall 83
Essex CC	Electronics Technology	AA&Cert	Fall 83
	Emergency Medical Tech	AA&Cert	Fall 83
Howard Community Col	Residential Construction	AA	Fall 83
University of Balt.	Taxation	LLM	Fall 83
Morgan	Computer Science	BS	Fall 83
	Information Systems	BS	Fall 83
	Adapted & Dev. Phys. Ed.	MS	Fall 83
	International Studies	MA	Fall 83
UMAB School of Phar.	Pharmacy Pract & Admin Sci	MS&PhD	Fall 83
UMCP	Turf and Urban Agronomy	BS	Fall 83
	Soil, Water and Conservation	BS	Fall 83
	Business Administration	PhD	Fall 83
	Degree Change DBA to PhD		
Goucher	Information Services Mgmt	MA	Fall 83
Loyola	Mathematical Sciences	BS	Fall 83
Peabody	Music History & Criticism	MM	Fall 83
June, 1983			
Morgan	Engineering Physics	BS	Fall 83
UMCP	Construction Eng. & Mgmt (Option in Civil Eng.)	BS,MS, &PhD	Fall 83

TABLE 57

PROGRAMS APPROVED FOR DISCONTINUANCE
JULY 1982 TO JUNE 1983

Institution	Program Area	Degree	Eff. Date
July, 1982			
Howard CC	Interpreter Ed.	AA	July, 1982
November, 1982			
Com Coll Balt.	Envir. Health Tech	AA&Cert	November, 1982
	Medical Lab Tech	AA	November, 1982
	Occ. Health Nursing	Cert	November, 1982
	Occ. Therapy Asst.	AA	November, 1982
	Oceanography	AA&Cert	November, 1982
	Piano Technology	AA&Cert	November, 1982
UMAB	Radiologic Tech	BS&Cert	June, 1983
January, 1983			
Towson	Health Records Admin	BS	January, 1983
March, 1983			
Charles CC	Pollut. Abatement Tech	AA	March, 1983
	Secretarial Science	AA	March, 1983
Chesapeake CC	Marine Maint. Tech	Cert	March, 1983
	Real Estate	AA	March, 1983
May, 1983			
Towson	Public Address	BA/BS	Fall, 1981
June, 1983			
UMES	Building Construction	BS	June, 1983

STATEWIDE PROGRAMS AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

For a number of years Maryland community colleges have cooperated in offering certain programs to residents of other Maryland jurisdictions. The Plan supports increased funding for these efforts. These arrangements provide for out-of-county students to be reimbursed for the nonresident tuition differential when enrolled in a designated program. The purpose of this arrangement is to maximize access to specialized programs while at the same time minimizing the need for duplicate programs.

Status

Below is a summary of the extent to which the State Board for Community Colleges (SBCC) has been able to reimburse students in Statewide programs for the out-of-county tuition differential they have been charged.

Fiscal Year	Total Funds	% of Differential Reimbursed to Students
1978	$13,296	54%
1979	29,204	53%
1980	55,000	68%
1981	75,000	69%
1982	75,000	71%
1983	75,000	74%

FY 1980 was the first year in which State General Funds were appropriated for the program. Federal funds had supported the program previously. This has resulted in an increase in the percentage of the tuition differential that can be reimbursed to the students participating. Table 58 shows those programs currently designated as Statewide programs.

Action

SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT REQUESTS BY THE STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR FUNDING FOR STATEWIDE PROGRAMS.

TABLE 58

STATEWIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Allegany Community College
- Dental Hygiene
- Forest Technology
- Respiratory Therapy

Anne Arundel Community College
- EMT Paramedic

Community College of Baltimore
- Dental Hygiene
- International Trade
- Physical Therapy Assistant
- Respiratory Therapy Technology

Catonsville Community College
- Air Transportation Management
- Mortuary Science
- Occupational Safety and Health Tech

Cecil Community College
- Professional Photography

Dundalk Community College
- Labor Studies
- Retail Floristry
- Stationary Engineering Technology

Essex Community College
- Animal Science Technician

Garrett Community College
- Veterinary Science Technology
- Wildlife Management

Harford Community College
- Electrodiagnostic Technology
- Science Laboratory Technology (Histotechnology option)

Montgomery College
- Fire Science

Prince George's Community College
- Dental Assistant
- Medical Laboratory Technology
- Medical Records Technology
- Nuclear Medicine Technology
- Respiratory Therapist

Wor-Wic Tech Community College
- Hotel-Motel-Restuarant Management
- Nursing, Practical
- Nursing, Registered

IV. FINANCE

The Plan contains a number of recommendations concerning budgeting and funding for postsecondary education.

PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Status

To improve the quality of public higher education additional resources are required. Public higher education in Maryland has relied historically on three primary sources of funds for its support: State General Funds; Tuition, and Fee Revenues; and Federal Funds. While institutions must do all they can to preserve and increase funding from current sources, they also should attempt to give greater emphasis to a fourth source of revenue: private funds. Funding from private funds can be used to provide a margin of excellence in a constrained funding environment.

The public four-year institutions have relatively small endowments. The University of Maryland, with an endowment of $16 million, has the largest endowment among the public institutions in Maryland.

Action

THE SBHE, IN COOPERATION WITH THE SEGMENTS, SHOULD MEET DURING FY 1984 TO DEVELOP A STRATEGY TO INCREASE THE FUND-RAISING POTENTIAL OF EACH PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION. IN ADDITION, THE SBHE SHOULD WORK WITH THE LEGISLATURE AND EXECUTIVE TO INSURE THAT AN UNDERSTANDING EXISTS THAT ANY PRIVATE FUNDS RAISED BY THE INSTITUTIONS ARE IN ADDITION TO, NOT IN PLACE OF, STATE GENERAL FUNDS.

STATE SUPPORT FOR INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS

As part of the Fourth Annual Review of the Plan, the SBHE adopted the following guidelines for making future decisions about extraordinary financial assistance requested by independent colleges.

1. Can the institution continue to offer a program of adequate scope and quality without supplemental State assistance?

2. What are the characteristics of the institution or its programs that make it in the clear interest of the State to provide it with supplemental assistance?

3. To what extent would student access to higher education be affected if programs were eliminated or if the campus were closed?

4. What programs does the institution offer which would have to be added or expanded in the public sector if the programs were no longer offered by the institution, either because of elimination or closure? What would be the fiscal impact?

5. What are the specific types of special assistance which would enable the institution to continue to operate? What level of activity would each type of assistance support? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each?

6. What would be the long-term financial obligation incurred by the State under the various alternatives?

7. How does the priority for this request fit into the priorities for higher education throughout the entire State?

During FY 1983, the SBHE did not receive any new requests from independent institutions for operating budget assistance outside of the State aid formula. The State continued its program of providing $900,000 annually for the Peabody Conservatory of Johns Hopkins University.

TUITION GUIDELINES

Status

The Maryland State Board for Higher Education (SBHE) was directed by the April 1982 Report of the Joint Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee to provide a report on tuition and fees. The report, provided in response to the Joint Chairmen's request, was presented to the Joint Chairmen and the Committees in June, 1982. Included in the report were the results of a survey conducted by the SBHE of other states' tuition policies, information on current Maryland practice, and comparisons of Maryland practice to those of other states.

The results of the tuition survey indicated that 22 states had tuition policies that related tuition to the cost of education, to benchmark or peer institutions or states, or to variables outside of higher education, such as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or per capita income. In most states tuition and mandatory charges were lowest at the community colleges and highest at the research universities. One-half of the states differentiated between undergraduate and graduate mandatory charges; all the states had different mandatory charges for

resident and non-resident undergraduate students. However, in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina certain campuses charge resident and non-resident graduate students the same amount. Several states, including Florida and Michigan, differentiated tuition charges for upper and lower division undergraduate students.

In Maryland's public four-year colleges and universities, tuition for undergraduate resident students who attend full-time varied by campus, but were about the same at the state colleges and at the University of Maryland (in FY 1982 and FY 1983). For FY 1984 it is anticipated that tuition at the University of Maryland will exceed that at the State colleges and universities.

When compared to mandatory charges for full-time undergraduate residents in other states, Maryland's mandatory charges at the State universities and colleges and at the community colleges were consistently greater than the national average and higher than the average of charges of states in the SREB region. The mandatory charges for full-time undergraduate residents at the University of Maryland were higher than the charges in the SREB states, about equal to the national average, and lower than the charges at the research universities in the contiguous states.

Between FY 1973 and FY 1984, tuition has increased at approximately the same rate as inflation. Increases in tuition in Maryland since FY 1981 have exceeded the rate of inflation (Table 59).

Action

THE FOLLOWING TUITION GUIDELINES FOR THE PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN MARYLAND HAVE BEEN ADOPTED BY THE SBHE.

1. The State contribution for Instruction and Instruction-related costs as defined by the State Board for Higher Education guidelines should be no less than seventy percent.

2. Non-resident full-time undergraduate students should be charged more tuition than resident full-time undergraduate students.

3. Graduate students should be charged more than undergraduates.

4. Part-time charges for undergraduate resident students should be at least equivalent to full-time undergraduate student charges.

TABLE 59

UNDERGRADUATE FULL-TIME MARYLAND RESIDENT TUITION CHARGES
MARYLAND FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
FY 1981 - FY 1984

	Actual FY 1981	Actual FY 1982	Actual FY 1983	Est. FY 1984	Average Annual %Change
University of Maryland					
College Park	$737	$905	$997	$1,128	15.2
Eastern Shore	570	711	782	900	16.5
Baltimore County	737	905	997	1,128	15.2
Weighted Average	$733	$900	$991	$1,122	15.3
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges					
Bowie	$785	$870	$960	$1,030	9.5
Coppin	785	870	960	1,030	9.5
Frostburg	785	870	960	1,030	9.5
Salisbury	775	870	960	1,030	9.9
Towson	785	870	960	1,030	9.5
Univ. of Baltimore	785	870	990	1,074	11.0
Weighted Average	$784	$870	$964	$1,036	9.7
St. Mary's	$675	$875	$1,120	$1,220	21.8
Morgan	700	745	870	935	10.1
Weighted Average	$748	$879	$ 976	$1,081	13.0
CPI	259.6	281.5	298.8	308.4	5.9

5. Tuition at the four-year public colleges and universities should be less than the tuition at the University of Maryland. In those cases where this is not true currently, adjustments will be made over a period of at least five years.

6. Resident tuition at the community colleges should be less than tuition at the four-year colleges and universities.

7. Tuition for medical, dental, and law school students should be more than tuition for other graduate students.

These are to be used as "guidelines." Special circumstances may merit consideration of deviation from these guidelines.

FINANCIAL AID

During FY 1983, the SBHE prepared "Student Financial Support in Maryland Postsecondary Education: A Descriptive Summary." The report provides a comprehensive review of the types and amount of support available to students at Maryland institutions.

In order to compile this report, the SBHE developed a comprehensive data base on financial aid. The Board's data base includes both aggregate information on the amount of aid received by all the students at each institution and individual student information on the amount and types of aid received by various kinds of students.

The aggregate data are reported annually by Maryland's public institutions. The number of awards and dollar amounts for each type of financial aid are reported along with the unduplicated number of aid recipients for each category (Grants, Scholarships, Loans, and Employment).

For 1980-81 and 1981-82, the SBHE asked the Independent Colleges and Universities, and the Independent Postsecondary Institutions to report their financial aid data in a similar manner. The cooperation of these institutions in providing the SBHE the requested data made it possible to have a more complete view of the financial aid available to Maryland students.

The second type of data used in this report are data on the family characteristics and college attendance of student aid applicants and recipients in Maryland from the following sources:

A. The College Scholarship Service (CSS) data tape on Maryland residents who applied for Pell Grants through CSS for 1981-82. Family income and Pell index information are provided on this tape. This tape includes 34,930 records.

B. The State Board for Higher Education (SBHE) data tape on Fall enrollment at Maryland public institutions. The matching of CSS and SBHE tapes produced 20,208 records. This means that of the 34,930 Maryland Pell applicants, 20,208 attended public institutions in Maryland.

C. The Maryland Higher Education Loan Corporation's (MHELC) data tape on Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) recipients in Maryland. This tape has 42,623 records. The match of this GSL tape with the SBHE tape produced 17,794 records. This means that 17,794 students at Maryland public institutions in 1981-82 received GSL's.

D. The State Scholarship Board's (SSB) data file on all applicants for all SSB programs with 42,317 records.

The matching of the four CSS, SBHE, GSL, and SSB tapes produced a data file on all Maryland residents who attended public institutions and had applied for a Pell Grant, GSL, or an SSB award in 1981-82.

Status and Action

Having completed the financial aid report, the Legislature requested that:

> "....the State Board for Higher Education continue to update and improve its data base regarding student financial aid availability and need in postsecondary education. The impact on individual institutions/segments and the type of aid best suited to address unmet need should be identified for possible use by the Executive. It is further recommended that a representative task force be established by SBHE to address policy recommendations concerning the State's future role in student financial aid support."

In response to this request, the State Board for Higher Education established a Financial Aid Task Force. The Task Force was composed of members from the House of Delegates, a representative from the Governor's office and the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, representatives from all segments of higher education, financial aid officers, the directors of the State Scholarship Board and the Higher Education Loan Corporation, and a student representative. It was chaired by the Vice-Chairman of the SBHE. Meeting bi-weekly beginning in Spring 1983, the Task Force reviewed a considerable amount of data related to student financial aid programs in Maryland and other states, and discussed a broad array of issues related to the goals and objectives of student financial aid programs.

The Task Force recommendations listed below were adopted by SBHE in November, 1983.

I. CHANGES TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

A. GENERAL STATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM - THIS PROGRAM SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE THE STATE'S MAJOR NEED-BASED SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM. IT CURRENTLY IS FUNDED AT A LEVEL OF $3.1 MILLION, WITH $1.7 MILLION PROVIDED BY GENERAL FUNDS AND THE REMAINDER OF THE FUNDS COMING FROM THE FEDERAL SSIG PROGRAM. FUNDING IN THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE INCREASED BY $3 MILLION IN GENERAL FUNDS WITH $2 MILLION OF THE INCREASE PROVIDED IN FY 1985. THE TASK FORCE'S SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS PROGRAM ARE LISTED BELOW.

1. ANY LOSSES IN FEDERAL SSIG FUNDS SHOULD BE OFFSET BY GENERAL FUNDS. THE PROGRAM HAD $1.4 MILLION IN SSIG FUNDS IN FY 1983 BUT WILL RECEIVE ONLY $1.1 MILLION IN FY 1984. THE STATE SHOULD REPLACE THE $250,000 WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN LOST IN THE FY 1985 BUDGET.

2. THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE STUDENTS WHO RECEIVE GSS AWARDS SHOULD BE INCREASED.

3. AID SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE DISTRIBUTED BY LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT.

4. THE AMOUNT OF THE GSS AWARD SHOULD BE INCREASED TO 30 PERCENT OF UNMET NEED AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT FAMILY CONTRIBUTION AND PELL AWARDS. THIS WILL PROVIDE A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF AID FOR THOSE STUDENTS WHO RECEIVE AWARDS.

5. THE MAXIMUM GSS SHOULD BE INCREASED FROM $1.500 TO $2,000. THE $1,500 MAXIMUM IS NOW SERVING AS AN ARTIFICIAL CEILING FOR STUDENTS WHO ARE GOING TO HIGH COST INSTITUTIONS.

6. IN ORDER TO RETAIN A GSS AWARDS, A STUDENT MUST BE MAKING SATISFACTORY PROGRESS AT THE INSTITUTION. A STUDENT MAY NOT RECEIVE AN AWARD FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.

7. THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS IN THE GSS PROGRAM WILL BE INCREASED ANNUALLY BY A PERCENTAGE AMOUNT EQUIVALENT TO THE INCREASE IN TUITION AND MANDATORY FEES AT MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION. THIS PROVISION WILL ALLOW SCHOLARSHIP FUNDS IN THIS PROGRAM TO KEEP PACE WITH THE ANNUAL INCREASES IN COST OF ATTENDANCE.

8. STUDENTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO HOLD BOTH A GENERAL STATE SCHOLARSHIP AND A SENATORIAL SCHOLARSHIP.

B. DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR PROGRAM - THE AWARD IN THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE INCREASED FROM $800 TO $1,000 PER STUDENT. THIS WILL REQUIRED $240,000 TO FUND THIS INCREASE IN THE 1,200 SCHOLARSHIPS IN THIS PROGRAM.

C. PROPRIETARY SCHOOL PROGRAM - FUNDING IN THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE INCREASED $100,000 TO PROVIDE AID FOR ADDITIONAL ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS. THIS WILL PROVIDE $200,000 IN THE PROGRAM.

D. PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL PROGRAM - FUNDING IN THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE INCREASED BY $60,000 TO PROVIDE AID FOR ADDITIONAL ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS. THIS WILL PROVIDE $210,000 IN THE PROGRAM.

E. DELEGATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM- THE RULES IN THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE CHANGED TO PROVIDE EACH DELEGATE WITH THE FUNDS EQUIVALENT TO IN-STATE TUITION AND MANDATORY FEES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND-COLLEGE PARK FOR TWO STUDENTS. THE DELEGATES SHOULD THEN BE PERMITTED TO DISTRIBUTE THESE FUNDS AMONG AS MANY STUDENTS AS THEY CHOOSE.

II. NEW PROGRAMS

A. COLLEGE WORK STUDY - THIS PROGRAM SHOULD RECEIVE $2 MILLION IN STATE FUNDS IN FY 1985.

1. THE STATE SHOULD ESTABLISH A MARYLAND COLLEGE WORK STUDY PROGRAM. THE STATE PROGRAM SHOULD BE AS SIMILAR AS POSSIBLE TO THE FEDERAL COLLEGE WORK STUDY PROGRAM SO THAT ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES WOULD BE SIMPLIFIED AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS MINIMIZED.

2. THE PURPOSE OF THE MARYLAND WORK STUDY PROGRAM IS TO PROVIDE SELF-HELP STUDENT FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS WITH DEMONSTRATED FINANCIAL NEED ATTENDING ELIGIBLE POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND. SUCH SELF-HELP OPPORTUNITY ALLOWS STUDENTS TO EARN SOME PORTION OF THE R EXPENSES.

3. A STUDENT IS ELIGIBLE FOR AN AWARD IF HE/SHE IS ENROLLED AT LEAST HALF-TIME AS A GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE AT AN ELIGIBLE MARYLAND INSTITUTION, IS MAINTAINING SATISFACTORY PROGRESS ACCORDING TO INSTITUTIONAL POLICY, AND HAS DEMONSTRATED FINANCIAL NEED AS CALCULATED THROUGH AN APPROVED NEEDS ANALYSIS SYSTEM.

4. SEVERAL PROCEDURES WERE DISCUSSED FOR ALLOCATING FUNDS TO INSTITUTIONS INCLUDING THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA FOR THE COLLEGE WORK STUDY PROGRAM AND DISTRIBUTION BASED ON ENROLLMENT. IT IS RECOMMENDED A FORMULA BE DEVELOPED TO DISTRIBUTE FUNDS AMONG MARYLAND INSTITUTIONS.

5. AN ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER IS A NON-PROFIT INSTITUTION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND ANY OTHER NON-PROFIT, NONSECTARIAN ORGANIZATION OR GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY. AFTER THE FIRST YEAR OF OPERATION, CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN TO ALLOWING STUDENTS TO WORK AT CERTAIN FOR-PROFIT BUSINESSES WHICH OFFER WORK EXPERIENCES WHICH ARE RELATED TO THEIR MAJOR.

6. A STUDENT MAY WORK A MAXIMUM OF 20 HOURS PER WEEK DURING TERM TIME EMPLOYMENT AND 40 HOURS PER WEEK DURING NON-TERM TIME EMPLOYMENT. A STUDENT MAY NOT HAVE MARYLAND WORK-STUDY AND FEDERAL WORK-STUDY IN COMBINATION EXCEEDING THE ABOVE LIMITS.

7. THE STATE SHARE OF THE ALLOCATION IS 100 PERCENT TO THE PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND 80 PERCENT OF THE STUDENT'S COMPENSATION AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REMAINING 20 PERCENT AND FOR ALL LEGALLY REQUIRED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS (I.E.,SOCIAL SECURITY, WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION, ETC.). THE FEDERAL CWS ALLOCATION CANNOT BE USED IN THIS MATCH.

8. IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS PROGRAM SUPPLEMENT, NOT REPLACE, CURRENT INSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS IN STUDENT FINANCIAL AID. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS INCURRED BY PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS WILL BE ASSUMED BY THE INSTITUTION.

9. THE WAGE RATE SHALL BE NO LESS THAN THE MINIMUM WAGE RATE.

10. INSTITUTIONAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICERS WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MONITORING STUDENT EARNINGS IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT A STUDENT'S EARNINGS AND OTHER FINANCIAL AID AWARDS DO NOT EXCEED THE AMOUNT OF CALCULATED FINANCIAL NEED. THE AID OFFICERS WILL TAKE STEPS NECESSARY TO ADJUST THE AID PACKAGE AS REQUIRED. THE AID OFFICERS WILL ALSO MONITOR THE STUDENT'S FINANCIAL AID TO ENSURE THAT THE SUM OF ALL STUDENT RESOURCES AND AID DO NOT EXCEED THE COST OF ATTENDANCE. THE COST OF ATTENDANCE INCLUDES TUITION, ROOM, BOARD, BOOKS, SUPPLIES, PERSONAL EXPENSES AND OTHER REASONABLE EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES.

11. STUDENTS RECEIVING FUNDS FROM THIS PROGRAM WILL SUPPLEMENT EXISTING CAMPUS EMPLOYEES. STUDENTS WILL NOT BE USED TO SUPPLANT EXISTING EMPLOYEES.

B. <u>TEACHERS IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE</u>

1. A MERIT-BASED PROGRAM OF SCHOLARSHIPS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO BECOME TEACHERS IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE. CURRENTLY, MATH AND SCIENCE TEACHERS ARE IN VERY SHORT SUPPLY. THE PROGRAM SHOULD BE HIGHLY COMPETITIVE AND PERCEIVED AS AN HONOR.

2. SCHOLARSHIPS OF $2,500 EACH SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE EACH YEAR TO STUDENTS WHO ARE MARYLAND RESIDENTS WHO ATTEND AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MARYLAND. AT LEAST $50,000 SHOULD BE APPROPRIATED FOR THESE AWRARDS IN THE FIRST YEAR. SUBSEQUENT YEAR APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE BASED ON EXPERIENCE AND APPROXIMATE NEED.

3. SCHOLARSHIPS WILL GO TO ENTERING FRESHMEN WITH A HIGH SCHOOL GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF 3.5 ON A 4.0 SCALE. AWARDS WILL BE DISTRIBUTED TO UPPERCLASSMEN BASED ON COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE. A MINIMUM AVERAGE OF 3.0 WILL BE REQUIRED TO RECEIVE AN AWARD. A COMMITTEE SHOULD BE APPOINTED TO MAKE THE SELECTION AMONG THE APPLICANTS IF FUNDS ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR ALL ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.

4. IN ORDER TO RETAIN THE SCHOLARSHIP, A STUDENT MUST HAVE AT LEAST A 3.0 AVERAGE IN COLLEGE WORK AND BE MAKING SATISFACTORY PROGRESS TOWARD THE DEGREE. A STUDENT MAY NOT RECEIVE THIS SCHOLARSHIP FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR AT EACH GRADE LEVEL.

5. FOR EACH YEAR A STUDENT RECEIVES THE SCHOLARSHIP, THE STUDENT MUST AGREE TO TEACH FOR ONE YEAR IN AN AREA OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL IN MARYLAND. IF THIS OBLIGATION IS NOT FULFILLED, THE AMOUNT OF THE SCHOLARSHIP PLUS INTEREST AT A RATE EQUAL TO THE PRIME RATE PLUS ONE PERCENT MUST BE REPAID TO THE STATE WITHIN A PERIOD NOT TO EXCEED TEN YEARS.

III. AREAS OF FURTHER STUDY

A. AID TO GRADUATE STUDENTS - A TASK FORCE SHOULD BE FORMED TO ASSESS THE ADEQUACY OF AID TO GRADUATE STUDENTS.

B. LIMITS ON AID PROVIDED BY THE STATE SCHOLARSHIP BOARD - THE STATE SCHOLARSHIP BOARD SHOULD MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE AMOUNT OF MONEY IN TOTAL SSB AWARDS A STUDENT MAY RECEIVE.

C. THE STATE SCHOLARSHIP BOARD SHOULD GIVE CONSIDERATION TO WHAT THE BEST SYSTEM IS FOR WEIGHTING NEED AND ABILITY AMONG STUDENTS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR GENERAL STATE SCHOLARSHIPS IN ORDER TO MOST EQUITABLY RATION THE FUNDS IN THE PROGRAM.

BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT FLEXIBILITY

The SBHE FY 1984 Consolidated Budget includes the following recommendation. "The SBHE affirms that each segment should be allocated its operating budget and accorded flexibility in the expenditure of the funds. In order to maintain quality with constrained budgets, it is vital that each segment have the ability to respond to situations requiring budget reallocations in a timely manner. In addition, institutions must have the ability to carry forward funds. It is the responsibility of the segments and the SBHE to post-audit and evaluate the expenditures of funds as well as the accomplishments of each institution. All of the FY 1981 financial statements, budgets, and enrollments of the public four-year institutions were audited by independent auditors. Unanimity exists among higher education on the need for budget flexibility. The current system of pre-audit by review agencies in the State results in unnecessary delays as well as excessive paperwork. In addition,

the current system provides a framework in which responsibility for the operation of an institution is unclear. Each segment must be able to make all the managerial decisions necessary for efficient operation of its institutions."

Status

The Governor has appointed a committee chaired by the Lieutenant Governor and composed of legislators and higher education segmental Board members to study the need for flexibility in higher education. The SBHE is represented by the Chairman of its Board. The Committee has been meeting throughout the summer. A report is expected shortly.

BUDGET STRUCTURE

The Plan contains the recommendation that the SBHE initiate discussions with the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning and the Legislature to determine the feasibility of developing budget formats that require less detailed expenditure requests. This would reduce the burden of budget preparation as well as provide institutions with more flexibility to expend funds within specific budget programs.

Status

The SBHE, DBFP, Legislative Analyst, Comptroller, and the segments have had extensive discussions on budget formats for the FY 1985 budget submission.

All parties agreed that the reporting by higher education should be uniform among institutions and that the number of delineated budget programs should be reduced. The group examined several alternatives for achieving this goal and concluded that the best solution was to adopt the GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) format. This format provides a standard set of programs for all institutions with specific definitions for each program. Acceptance of the GAAP program structure will reduce the number of programs by about 40 percent.

Full implementation of GAAP requires other changes in the budget structure. Currently, higher education delineates its revenues according to General Funds, Special Funds and Federal Funds. GAAP provides for Unrestricted and Restricted Current Funds. In addition, GAAP may provide that funds are maintained on an accrual basis rather than a cash basis.

At the present time, the higher education institutions have been keeping two sets of books: one in the State format and one according to GAAP. The GAAP structure is required for Federal reporting on the HEGIS finance form and is required for reporting to the State's independent auditors so that they can prepare the State's financial statements.

Action

THE FY 1985 BUDGET WAS SUBMITTED IN A MODIFIED GAAP PROGRAM STRUCTURE. IT IS EXPECTED THAT FULL GAAP BUDGETING WILL BE IMPLEMENTED FOR THE FY 1986 BUDGET REQUEST. DISCUSSIONS WILL CONTINUE WITH THE SEGMENTS, THE DBFP, THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST AND THE COMPTROLLER SO THAT PROGRESS CAN CONTINUE TO BE MADE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GAAP BUDGETING.

BUDGET ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The Plan recommends the SBHE budgetary guidelines be utilized to examine budgetary requests from public colleges and universities. This approach, which concentrates on total program costs and analysis of the costs of comparable programs among institutions, is recommended because of its focus on broad issues and on the distribution of funds according to a number of performance measures. The Plan further recommends that the SBHE, the segments, the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, and the Department of Fiscal Services agree on guidelines to be used each year. The SBHE, the segments and the Department of Fiscal Services have worked together on revisions to the current operating budget guidelines.

Status

The State Board for Higher Education was directed by the April 1982 Report of the Joint Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee to provide a report regarding the current status of the Board's funding guidelines. The report provides information on the development of the guidelines since their inception in 1976 and discusses all of the changes made to the original guidelines, including the revision of the Public Safety guideline at the suggestion of the Joint Chairmen. In addition the method for annually revising the guidelines to reflect the impact of inflation is discussed.

In the development of the guidelines, and in the on-going revision process, the State Board for Higher Education has considered that the guidelines were to produce a maintenance budget for an institution. Some portion of this "maintenance budget" will be met by General Funds with the remainder being met by Special and Federal Funds. The Statewide Plan indicates that the expenditures at the institutions should be at 100 percent of the Guidelines and that State General Funds should provide 70 percent of the funds needed for the guideline programs. The guidelines do not account for an institution's special needs when initiating a program or when catching up in an area. As the guidelines were developed, no attempt was made to determine the adequacy of total funding relative to peer institutions or to where higher education "should" be funded;

rather, the guidelines were developed in the context of current State funding parameters.

The guideline for Instruction has three components: a fixed cost, a variable cost component for instruction, and a variable cost component for departmental research. The research component was not explicitly included in the original guidelines; it has been included in the revised guidelines to delineate more clearly institutional roles and missions. The variable cost component for instruction is a 4 x 4 matrix of costs per credit hour delineated by course level and program cost. In consideration of an environment in which some colleges and universities are facing declining enrollments, some are expanding enrollment and services to students, and some are experiencing shifts in levels of enrollment and academic fields, the Instruction guideline provides two computational options for a school. Alternative A allows an institution to use only its projected credit hours in the matrix, while Alternative B allows an institution to use the average of its actual and projected credit hours.

The guideline for the Administration program consists of three parts: a fixed cost component, a component related to enrollment, and a component related to the number of non-guideline programs. The number of non-guideline programs represents a measure of the complexity of the school. The revised Library guideline is composed of five parts: a fixed cost component; a component for normal, on-going book purchases; a component to reflect faculty needs; a component for enrollment needs; and a component to reflect research needs. The revised Student Services guideline recognizes that there is a fixed cost component associated with non-academic services for students and that the variable costs of this program are related to the number of admission applications and FTES. The Public Safety guideline was revised to reflect changes in services and has four components: a fixed cost; a component related to students; a measure related to size and complexity of the institution (GSF); and a measure to reflect geographic location (UR). Four guideline institutions are considered to be "urban" campuses: Coppin, Morgan, University of Baltimore, and University of Maryland - College Park. The Physical Plant guideline has four components: a fixed cost; a measure of the building space maintained; a component related to student use; and fuel and utilities.

Action

During FY1985, as in the past, the guidelines will be evaluated to determine if any modifications are required.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES

The Plan contains a recommendation that faculty and administrative salary levels at all public colleges and

universities be competitive with those at comparable institutions. Specifically recommended in the 1978 Plan was additional funding for faculty salaries beginning in FY 1980 for UMCP (which SBHE analysis had identified as being particularly low in comparison to similar campuses) to permit it to bring salaries closer to competitive levels.

Status

The SBHE supported $1.4M in the FY 1980 budget request for UMCP faculty salary increases over and above Statewide across-the-board increases. The 1979 Maryland General Assembly appropriated $1 million for the entire University for retention and recruitment of outstanding faculty. For FY 1981, the Legislature appropriated $0.5 million to be used entirely for recruitment of outstanding faculty. For FY1982, the Legislature appropriated $500,000; for FY1983, $600,000; and for FY1984, the Legislature appropriated $550,000 for recruitment of outstanding faculty at the University of Maryland. In FY1983, all faculty received a nine percent cost-of-living increase and the faculty at the University of Maryland received average salary increases of more than five percent for merit increases while the State college faculty received about 2.5 percent for merit increases. In FY1984, the faculty at the University of Maryland will receive average merit increases of 5.15 percent while the State college faculty will receive average merit increases of 2.5 percent to 3.0 percent. The increases will be effective in January. Faculty salaries at UMCP and UMAB still remain below the average salaries paid by comparable institutions. However, faculty salaries at the State Universities and Colleges have remained at about the 75th percentile of the AAUP category IIA institutions. The FY 1983 salary increases allowed the University to make improvements in its relative salary position.

The SBHE report "Administrative Salaries in Maryland Public Postsecondary Education" (January, 1980) indicated that overall administrative salaries at Maryland public institutions were about ten percent below the average salaries at comparable institutions. An update of this information indicates that administrative salaries are now almost 15 percent below the average salaries at comparable institutions. The difference by segment ranged from equal to the average at Morgan to 12 percent below the average at the University of Maryland and 17 percent below the average paid by comparable institutions at the State Universities and Colleges and St. Mary's. Additional funds were provided for administrative salary increases at the State Universities and Colleges for FY 1984.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS

Status

During the past several years a number of reports were prepared by the SBHE comparing the University of Maryland to a

group of institutions designated by the University as peers. The peers themselves, however, had not been systematically evaluated as to their comparability with the University of Maryland. During the past year the SBHE examined the peers at the request of the Joint Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee. The University of Maryland had used the following criteria in selecting its peers:

1. The institutions must be part of a public system, combined into a system or part of a system.

2. The Land Grant institution of the State should be included.

3. The system should include a medical school and other professional schools.

4. The principal campus should be a member of the Association of American Universities.

5. The institutions should combine teaching, research, and service in their role and scope.

6. The institutions should represent "quality" systems.

7. The systems should include at least two doctoral granting campuses.

8. The systems should grant at least as many doctoral degrees as the University of Maryland and receive at least as many federal research funds per year.

The intent of the criteria was not to identify institutions that are idential to the University of Maryland, but to select a set of similar institutions as a basis for data collection and presentation of comparable data.

The institutions selected as peers by the University of Maryland were the following:

University of California System (10 campuses)
University of Illinois System (3 campuses)
University of Michigan System (3 campuses)
and Michigan State University
University of Texas System (11 campuses)
University of Wisconsin System
(Madison and Milwaukee campuses only)

The SBHE staff accumulated comparable data about faculty, student enrollments, academic programs, research funding, and ranking of graduate programs for all of these institutions. A

description of the relevant data and findings in each of these areas was outlined in the report to the Joint Chairmen.

Action

AS A RESULT OF THE FINDINGS IN THE REPORT OF THE JOINT CHAIRMEN, THE SBHE RECOMMENDED THAT SEVERAL ADJUSTMENTS BE MADE TO THE PEER GROUP TO STRENGTHEN ITS UTILITY AS A COMPARATIVE TOOL. FIRST, IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT TEXAS A&M BE ADDED SO THAT THE LAND GRANT INSTITUTION FOR TEXAS IS INCLUDED AS A PEER. SECOND, IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS INCLUDED FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS BE REDUCED. BECAUSE THESE TWO SYSTEMS ARE SO LARGE, PEER AVERAGES ARE DISTORTED. THIRD, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE A MORE BALANCED REGIONAL REPRESENTATION, IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT THE PEER GROUP BE EXPANDED TO INCLUDE CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA SYSTEM, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA AND VPI AND SU. WITH THESE ADJUSTMENTS, THE SBHE BELIEVES THAT THE PEER COMPARISONS WILL PROVIDE A WELL BALANCED ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATIVE STANDING OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AMONG THE BEST PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

The SBHE and the University of Maryland agreed to use the following list of peers for the University.

University of California-Berkeley, Davis and San Diego
University of Illinois System
University of Michigan System
Michigan State University
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and
North Carolina State University
University of Texas-Austin and
Health Science Center at Houston
Texas A&M University
University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of Wisconsin-Madison and Milwaukee

The SBHE has prepared a comprehensive study comparing the University of Maryland with the new peer group. These data provide benchmarks to assess changes in the University of Maryland relative to its designated peers over time.

TOTAL FUNDING LEVELS

The following recommendation is contained in the Plan.

WITHIN FIVE YEARS ALL PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE FUNDED AT 100 PERCENT OF SBHE BUDGETARY GUIDELINE LEVELS IF WARRANTED ON THE BASIS

OF THE MERITS OF INSTITUTIONAL REQUESTS AND EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE. INSTITUTIONS WHICH ARE ABOVE OR BELOW 100 PERCENT OF THE GUIDELINE LEVEL SHOULD PLAN A TRANSITION TO REACH THE GUIDELINE LEVEL OF SPENDING IN NO MORE THAN FIVE YEARS. NEW PROGRAMS AND SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS, NOT PROVIDED FOR BY GUIDELINES, SHOULD BE JUDGED ON THEIR INDIVIDUAL MERITS.

Status

Table 60 indicates that the recommendation has not been met.

Assessment

In FY 1979, the four-year public institutions as a group were funded at 94.8 percent of the SBHE guidelines. Funding peaked in FY 1980 at 96.7 percent of the guidelines. Since then, there has been a decline in the total level of funding for the basic operating budgets of institutions in relation to the guidelines. The FY 1981 expenditures amounted to 90.8 percent of guidelines while the FY 1982 expenditures were 89.6 percent of the guidelines. FY 1983 expenditures were at 91.6 percent of the guidelines and the FY 1984 appropriation is at 88 percent of the guidelines. It should be noted that the FY 1984 appropriation provides for a slight increase relative to the guidelines as compared with the FY 1983 appropriation.

In FY 1979, seven institutions (UMCP, Bowie, Frostburg, Towson, Salisbury, the University of Baltimore, and St. Mary's) were below the guidelines. Nine of the institutions were below the guideline level of expenditures in FY 1983.

Action

THE STATE SHOULD MAKE AN EFFORT TO FUND PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AT 100 PERCENT OF SBHE GUIDELINES.

GENERAL FUND SUPPORT

The Plan contains the following recommendation.

WITHIN FIVE YEARS, THE STATE SHOULD PROVIDE 70 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL FUNDS NEEDED TO FUND GUIDELINE PROGRAMS AT PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. THE REMAINING INSTITUTIONAL COSTS SHOULD BE BORNE BY STUDENT TUITION AND FEES AND BY OTHER INSTITUTIONALLY GENERATED REVENUES. NON-GUIDELINE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE FUNDED BASED ON THEIR INDIVIDUAL MERITS.

TABLE 60

TOTAL FUND SUPPORT IN GUIDELINE* PROGRAMS
AS A PERCENT OF SBHE REVISED GUIDELINES

	FY 1980 Expenditures	FY 1981 Expenditures	FY 1982 Expenditures	FY 1983 Expenditures	FY 1984 Appropriation
University of Maryland					
College Park	92.8%	87.7%	87.1%	89.5%	86.4%
Eastern Shore	107.1%	106.1%	104.0%	102.6%	94.1%
Balt. County	108.4%	102.6%	99.4%	99.8%	96.3%
Av. Univ. of Md.	95.4%	90.4%	89.4%	91.5%	88.1%
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges					
Bowie	97.8%	94.6%	85.9%	91.9%	86.9%
Coppin	94.9%	95.8%	83.3%	91.8%	88.3%
Frostburg	111.3%	99.3%	95.1%	97.5%	94.2%
Salisbury	90.9%	87.1%	86.2%	88.7%	84.9%
Towson	98.9%	91.0%	91.6%	92.0%	88.0%
Univ. of Balt.	74.2%	72.5%	71.8%	72.4%	70.7%
Average BTSUC	95.0%	89.5%	86.8%	88.9%	85.4%
Morgan	118.4%	103.8%	107.6%	107.7%	104.5%
St. Mary's	99.4%	86.8%	87.8%	94.5%	86.0%
Average	96.7%	90.8%	89.6%	91.6%	88.1%

* Figures reflect revised budget guidelines

Status

Table 61 indicates that the recommendation has not been met.

Assessment

In FY 1979, 64.5 percent of total expenditures in the guideline programs at the public four-year institutions were supported with General Funds. This increased to 65.0 percent in FY 1980 and increased again to 65.2 percent in FY 1981. The FY 1982 expenditures provided for 62.6 percent in General Fund support while General Funds provided 63.8 percent of FY 1983 expenditures. The FY 1984 appropriation includes 61.9 percent General Fund support for the guidelines. There is considerable variation in the level of General Fund support in the FY 1984 appropiation, with the University of Baltimore receiving the lowest percentage of General Fund support (51.4 percent) and UMES the highest (79.7 percent). Most institutions remain very close to the same percentage of General Funds received in FY 1979. Three exceptions are Coppin (which increased from 61 percent to 76 percent), UMBC (which decreased from 78 percent to 68 percent) and St. Mary's (which decreased from 77 percent to 69 percent).

Action

THE OBJECTIVE OF MOVING TOWARD 70 PERCENT STATE SUPPORT OF GUIDELINE PROGRAMS, AS INDICATED IN THE ABOVE RECOMMENDATION, SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE FOLLOWED FOR PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS.

EVALUATION

The Plan provides that the SBHE develop a process for evaluating the overall effectiveness of operations at public institutions. Major purposes of the evaluation process are to help ensure quality and efficiency, to provide a better basis for policy and budgetary decisions, and to lessen the need for pre-audits and related budgetary controls. The SBHE has initiated two major efforts for evaluation of institutions: audits and joint evaluations in conjunction with regional accreditation visits.

Status and Action

During FY 1982, the SBHE contracted with Coopers and Lybrand to conduct financial and enrollment audits of FY 1981 data for all the public four-year institutions. Coopers and Lybrand reviewed the data systems which are used to provide the information for the SBHE's enrollment information system. The

TABLE 61

GENERAL FUND SUPPORT IN GUIDELINE PROGRAMS*
AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL FUNDS
IN GUIDELINE PROGRAMS

	FY 1980 Expenditures	FY 1981 Expenditures	FY 1982 Expenditures	FY 1983 Expenditures	FY 1984 Appropriation
University of Maryland					
College Park	60.1%	60.4%	58.0%	60.2%	57.7%
Eastern Shore	81.7%	82.1%	77.6%	82.7%	79.7%
Balt. County	74.5%	72.2%	69.2%	68.7%	67.6%
Av. Univ. of Md.	63.2%	63.1%	60.6%	62.4%	60.1%
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges					
Bowie	72.9%	75.0%	74.8%	75.8%	72.7%
Coppin	69.6%	72.2%	69.4%	68.8%	70.8%
Frostburg	70.7%	71.7%	70.6%	70.1%	69.5%
Salisbury	71.4%	68.6%	64.1%	65.1%	63.1%
Towson	64.2%	64.0%	60.9%	62.2%	60.9%
Univ. of Balt.	55.5%	58.4%	54.5%	53.4%	51.4%
Average BTSUC	66.6%	67.0%	64.1%	64.5%	63.2%
Morgan	69.9%	70.8%	70.0%	71.1%	69.6%
St. Mary's	74.0%	76.0%	69.4%	67.1%	66.6%
Average	65.0%	65.2%	62.6%	63.8%	61.9%

* Figures reflect revised budget guidelines

auditors found the enrollment information reported by the institutions accurate. Coopers and Lybrand gave all the institutions clean financial opinions with the exception of Bowie, where it qualified its opinion only because of the unavailability of records to support the historical cost of the college's investments in physical plant; and Morgan, where it was unable to render an opinion. In addition, the auditors provided management letters for each institution that included recommended changes in existing systems and procedures.

Audits of FY 1982 data for all the public four-year institutions were conducted. All institutions received clean audits with the exception of Morgan which received a qualified opinion. Audits of FY 1983 audits are now being conducted. The Board hopes that the receipt of clean opinions on post-audits will lessen the need for the extensive pre-audit requirements to which higher education is subject.

In addition, the SBHE has developed a joint arrangement with the Middle States Association for evaluating public campuses in the areas of general administration, finance, and physical facilities. Since 1979, 14 institutions have been evaluated through this arrangement. Three institutions are scheduled for evaluation this year.

STATE SUBSIDY OF AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE OPERATIONS

FY 1981 was the final year in which the State provided a subsidy to public four-year institutions for the plant operation and maintenance costs of auxiliary enterprise facilities. The State decreased its rate of subsidy for these operations by ten percent per year since FY 1972. The Plan contains a recommendation that this schedule continue to be followed because the subsidy provides benefits only to certain categories of students who in terms of equity should pay for these services. Appropriations, beginning in FY 1982, consistent with this policy, contain no State funding for auxiliary enterprises.

V. FACILITIES

The SBHE has undertaken with the University of Maryland at College Park a pilot obsolescence study to determine the need for comprehensive alteration and renovation of facilities. Many existing campus facilities appear to be in a state of substantial deterioration. It is, therefore, important that the State be fully appraised of the extent of the deterioration, including identification of facilities and the development of cost estimates for alterations, renovations, or razing. UMCP has substantially completed the initial efforts. They will include funding requests for capital renewal in their FY 1986 Capital Budget requests.

During FY 1984, the SBHE will produce a report on energy consumption in higher education. During the year, the staff will work with the segments and institutions to encourage energy conservation. The staff will facilitate the investment in energy conserving devices.

PRIORITIES FOR FUNDING FACILITIES

The State Plan and each Annual Review have established priorities which the SBHE has used in reviewing capital projects. These priorities have emphasized improvements to existing facilities over construction of new ones.

Status

For FY 1985 project requests, the SBHE will continue to utilize the same set of priorities as it has used during the three previous budget cycles.

Action

THE SBHE WILL UTILIZE THE FOLLOWING SET OF PRIORITY CATEGORIES, IN ADDITION TO EVALUATION OF THE MERITS OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS, IN REVIEWING FY 1985 CAPITAL PROJECT REQUESTS: (1) PROJECTS IMMEDIATELY REQUIRED TO PROTECT LIFE OR AVOID MAJOR PROPERTY DETERIORATION; (2) COMPLETION OF AND EQUIPPING OF PROJECTS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN FUNDED; (3) ENERGY CONSERVATION; (4) RENOVATION, ALTERATION AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FACILITIES; (5) IMPROVEMENT OF HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY; (6) UTILITIES IMPROVEMENTS; (7) SITE IMPROVEMENTS; (8) EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES; (9) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES; AND (10) PROPERTY ACQUISITION.

ELIMINATION OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

The Plan provided that each public segment submit to SBHE a plan for the elimination of deferred maintenance projects. The First Annual Review provided that each public segment submit five-year plans for eliminating deferred maintenance projects as part of their annual plans.

Status

Each of the public four-year institutions has submitted a list of its deferred maintenance projects through FY 1986 as a part of its FY 1982 Plan/MARC submission. The State Board for Community Colleges also has conducted an evaluation of deferred maintenance items at community college campuses.

Assessment

The State began providing General Fund support for deferred maintenance projects in FY 1979. However, requests for deferred maintenance projects have far exceeded appropriations. Furthermore, additional deferred maintenance projects are being added because there are inadequate funds for on-going maintenance at the institutions and very little funding for preventive maintenance programs. The Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning has recognized this problem and has included additional funds in the FY 1985 MARCs to increase the plant maintenance budgets. Even with these additional funds, it will take several years before the backlog of existing deferred maintenance projects is eliminated. Table 62 shows expenditures and appropriations for deferred maintenance projects by institution for FY 1979 through FY 1984.

Action

THE PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS SHOULD CONTINUE TO REQUEST AND THE SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT FUNDING TO ELIMINATE ALL DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROJECTS ON THEIR CAMPUSES.

PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PLANS

The Plan contains a recommendation that public institutions and segments submit five-year preventive maintenance plans. The 1979 Update to the Plan revised this recommendation indicating that instead of requiring submission of five-year plans the SBHE would review the annual submissions by public institutions and segments to the Department of General Services to determine the adequacy of their preventive maintenance programs. Based on this review, SBHE is to suggest any needed revisions.

Status

Four years of institutional evaluations of preventive maintenance plans have been received by the Department of General Services (DGS) and a copy has been sent by DGS to SBHE. The SBHE will continue to monitor the evaluations.

Action

THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS SHOULD CONTINUE TO SEND COPIES OF THE EVALUATIONS OF THEIR PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS REQUIRED BY DGS TO THE SBHE. THE SBHE WILL REVIEW THE EVALUATIONS AND INCORPORATE RECOMMENDATIONS INTO ITS BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS.

TABLE 62

FUNDING FOR DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

	FY 1979 Expenditures	FY 1980 Expenditures	FY 1981 Expenditures	FY 1982 Expenditures	FY 1983 Expenditures	FY 1984 Appropriation
Univ. of Md.						
UMAB	$ 417,562	$ 0	$ 851,338	$ 601,300	$ 841,300	$ 655,589
UMBC	$ 120,670	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0	$ 125,000	$ 125,000
UMCP	$2,291,830	$1,167,200	$1,102,179	$1,064,375	$1,662,000	$1,536,356
UMES	$ 56,027	$ 0	$ 25,000	$ 0	$ 130,000	$ 130,000
CEES	$ 190,056	$ 27,320	$ 0	$ 0	$ 35,000	$ 25,000
Agri. E. Sta.	$ 38,654	$ 127,111	$ 0	$ 0	$ 92,000	$ 17,000
Subtotal	$3,114,799	$1,321,631	$1,978,517	$1,665,675	$2,885,300	$2,488,945
Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges						
Board	$ 0	$ 0	$ 161,200	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
Bowie	$ 112,979	$ 84,000	$ 0	$ 76,908	$ 0	$ 0
Coppin	$ 57,639	$ 0	$ 0	$ 33,177	$ 0	$ 0
Frost.	$ 386,409	$ 86,000	$ 0	$ 17,134	$ 109,707	$ 111,720
Salis.	$ 212,416	$ 35,000	$ 0	$ 12,949	$ 0	$ 0
Towson	$ 372,595	$ 105,000	$ 0	$ 372,312	$ 544,833	$ 24,155
UB	$ 267,012	$ 0	$ 0	$ 14,520	$ 8,700	$ 0
Subtotal	$1,409,050	$ 310,000	$ 161,200	$ 482,000	$ 663,240	$ 135,875
Morgan	$ 0	$ 159,500	$ 0	$ 262,500	$ 0	$ 215,605
St. Mary's	$ 0	$ 107,100	$ 107,880	$ 125,000	$ 0	$ 0
TOTAL	$4,523,849	$1,898,231	$2,247,597	$2,535,175	$3,548,540	$2,840,425

HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY

The Plan provides that the SBHE request from public institutions and segments, beginning with their FY 1980 Capital budget requests, projects required to implement the provisions of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 concerning accessibility for the handicapped. Federal law requires that all programs be accessible to the handicapped by June, 1980.

Status

Public institutions submitted handicapped accessibility projects as part of their FY 1980 and FY 1981 Capital budget requests. These projects constituted Phase I of complying with the Federal legislation. Most institutions have been appropriated the funding required to comply with the Federal law. A few institutions will have additional handicapped accessibility requests in their FY 1984-FY 1987 Capital Budget submissions. The older campuses have had the greatest difficulty in complying with these guidelines as most of their facilities were constructed before architects took into account the needs of the handicapped in their designs. More than $5.0 million will be expended for facilities modifications. Funds for facilities modifications have been included in both operating and Capital Budgets. In FY 1985 and future years institutions also will submit capital requests for handicapped accessibility to the Governor's Office for the Handicapped.

Action

THE SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO MONITOR THE HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBILITY REQUESTS OF ALL OF THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

STATEWIDE FACILITIES INVENTORY

The Update to the Plan provides that the SBHE, in cooperation with the Department of State Planning and Segments, develop a facilities inventory system for all institutions of higher education.

Status

The initial inventory has been submitted. The inventory data will be updated each year.

Action

THE SBHE WILL PROVIDE WITHIN THE CONSOLIDATED BUDGET A REPORT SPECIFYING THE AMOUNT OF SPACE BY TYPE EACH YEAR.

REVIEW OF FACILITY SPACE REQUIREMENT GUIDELINES

The Update to the Plan provides that a review of the Space Guidelines for public four-year institutions be undertaken when the facilities inventory is completed.

Status

The Department of State Planning hired a consulting firm to assist in the revision of space guidelines for public four-year institutions. The firm worked with an advisory group composed of representatives from DSP,DBFP, SBHE, the University of Maryland and the State Universities and Colleges. DSP-approved guidelines were completed in July, 1981. SBHE approval took place in October, 1981.

Action

EACH CAMPUS WILL SUBMIT DATA ANNUALLY TO UPDATE THE CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT PLANS WHICH UTILIZE THE SPACE GUIDELINES TO SUPPORT SPACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.

CAMPUS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The Plan provides that campus development plan update data be submitted to the SBHE as part of annual Capital Budget requests by public institutions and segments. Institutions are encouraged to periodically update and upgrade campus development plans so that they can adequately justify the institutions' annual Capital Budget requests.

Status

All four year institutions have submitted updated campus development plans at the request of DSP. Review of these plans by the SBHE occurred during FY 1982. Completion of the Space Guidelines has been finalized by DSP and were approved by the SBHE. The Statewide Facilities Inventory has been updated through July, 1983. The FY 1983 inventory update was submitted to the SBHE concurrently with the FY 1985 Capital Budget requests.

There is a continuing need for up-to-date plans for Capital Budget review. Standardized inventories of campus facilities are available and detailed guidelines will be utilized to review Capital Budget requests for determining space needs.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

The Plan recommends two energy conservation measures: 1) that capital project requests for buildings include a life cycle cost and energy consumption analysis and 2) that public institutions of higher education participate in the Federal energy audit and construction programs of the National Energy Act.

Status

The Department of General Services has developed guidelines for carrying out life cycle cost and energy consumption analyses. These will be incorporated in all capital facilities (building) projects as required by DGS.

The Education Coordinating Committee has been designated as the group responsible for implementing provisions of the National Energy Act for education in Maryland. The SBHE and the State Department of Education participated in the development of the State's application for Federal funding to perform preliminary energy audits and energy audits as required by the Act.

Following promulgation of Federal guidelines, the SBHE and the State Department of Education (SDE) participated in developing a proposal for Federal funding of technical assistance to and energy conservation measures for institutions undertaking such projects. In addition, the SBHE and the SDE have provided assistance to all educational institutions which participate in this Act. The SBHE and the SDE will continue to provide assistance for the remainder of the Federal program.

Action

ALL PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS REGULARLY SUBMIT A MONTHLY REPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES (DGS) WHICH WILL BE MONITORED ANNUALLY BY THE SBHE ON REDUCTIONS IN ENERGY CONSUMPTION. CAPITAL PROGRAM STATEMENTS BEGINNING IN FY 1981 WERE REQUIRED TO CONTAIN DIRECTIONS TO THE A/E DESIGN TEAM TO INCLUDE LIFE CYCLE COSTS AND ENERGY CONSUMPTION ANALYSES DURING THE DESIGN PHASE. WITH THE EVENTUAL TERMINATION OF FEDERAL ENERGY FUNDING ASSISTANCE, THE SBHE WILL CONTINUE TO STUDY ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

VI. FACULTY, LIBRARIES, AND COMPUTER SERVICES

FACULTY

The Plan provides that the age, rank and tenure status of faculty in public institutions be studied. This analysis was recommended in light of the need for sound planning during a period of stable or declining enrollments.

Status

With implementation of a tape submission system for faculty data, it has become possible to carry out a great deal of analysis of employee data. To date, this information has been utilized most extensively in the Board's Indicators report, which was submitted to the Legislature in November 1985, as requested by the Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation and House Appropriations Committees. This report contains a detailed profile of trends for each public campus. It will be updated annually. The trends involving faculty characteristics that are contained in this report include: full-time/part-time percentages, percent tenured, age distribution, rank distribution, faculty by field of study compared to degrees awarded and credit hours generated, faculty salary levels, and faculty educational attainment. Trends in these areas provide a comprehensive view of the staffing pattern at each campus over time and a basis for comparisons with other Maryland institutions as well as with national studies.

LIBRARIES

The Library Advisory Committee composed of representatives from each of the segments of Maryland higher education assists the staff of the SBHE in addressing issues involving libraries.

During the past year, the major activity of the Committee has been development and testing of a new instrument for collecting information about libraries. Data on libraries have been collected regularly through (1) annual State budget submissions of public four-year colleges and universities and (2) less frequent federal government HEGIS data collection regarding libraries from both public and private four-year and two-year colleges and universities. Compatability between State and national data collection instruments will reduce the overall amount of data required from institutions. The data collected from these two instruments will be utilized to prepare a Statewide report on library characteristics.

COMPUTER SERVICES

The Plan provides for Statewide planning for academic computing in public institutions.

The State of Maryland, through legislative and executive actions, has established a clear mandate for the planning, control, and management of State automatic data processing (ADP) resources. The document entitled "State ADP Master Plan for the Eighties" provides the strategies and the framework within which the State's ADP needs can be met while maintaining effective management of ADP resources. In addition, this Plan identifies that the Management Information Systems Division of the Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning, in consultation with the Comptroller, shall be responsible for the planning and controlling of the State ADP function. The SBHE provides input through its budget recommendations and through consultation with MISD.